arXiv:1702.04625v1 [stat.ME] 15 Feb 2017

Non-separable Models with High-dimensional Data*

Liangjun Su† Takuya Ura‡ Yichong Zhang§

February 16, 2017

Abstract

This paper studies non-separable models with a continuous treatment when control variables are high-dimensional. We propose an estimation and inference procedure for average, quantile, and marginal treatment effects. In the procedure, control variables are selected via a localized method of L_1-penalization at each value of the continuous treatment. Finite sample properties of the new procedure are illustrated through both simulation and empirical applications.

Keywords: Unconditional average structural derivative, Nonparametric quantile regression, Least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (Lasso)

JEL codes: C21, I19

*First draft: February, 2017.

†School of Economics, Singapore Management University, 90 Stamford Road, Singapore 178903. E-mail: ljsu@smu.edu.sg

‡Department of Economics, University of California, Davis. One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616. E-mail: takura@ucdavis.edu

§School of Economics, Singapore Management University, 90 Stamford Road, Singapore 178903. E-mail: yczhang@smu.edu.sg

1 Introduction

Non-separable models without additivity appear frequently in econometric analyses, because economic theory motivates a nonlinear role of the unobserved individual heterogeneity (Altonji and Matzkin, 2005) and its multi-dimensionality (Browning and Carro, 2007). A large fraction of the previous literature on non-separable models has used control variables to achieve the unconfoundedness condition (Rosenbaum and Rubin, 1983), that is, the conditional independence between a regressor of interest (or a treatment) and the unobserved individual heterogeneity given the control variables. To justify the unconfoundedness condition in empirical frameworks, practitioners often include very many control variables (high-dimensional control variables) in their analyses. In spite of the fact that a treatment is continuous in many empirical settings (e.g., Galvao and Wang, 2015), however, it remains unanswered how we can use high-dimensional control variables in non-separable models with a continuous treatment.[1]

This paper proposes estimation and inference for unconditional parameters, including unconditional means of the potential outcomes, the unconditional cumulative distribution function, the unconditional quantile function, and the unconditional quantile partial derivative.[2] The proposed method estimates the parameters of interest in three stages. The first stage selects controls by the method of least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (Lasso) and predicts reduced-form parameters. We allow for different control variables to be selected at different values of the continuous treatment. The second stage recovers the marginal distribution of the potential outcome by plugging the reduced-form parameters into doubly robust moment conditions. The last stage recovers the quantile of the potential outcome and its derivative with respect to the treatment. The inference is implemented via a multiplier bootstrap without recalculating the first stage variable selections, which is one of the benefits from doubly robust moment conditions.

[1]The non-parametric identification and estimation of non-separable models have been investigated by Hirano and Imbens (2004), Hoderlein and Mammen (2007), and Galvao and Wang (2015), in which the controls have a *fixed* dimension.

[2]We focus on unconditional parameters, in which (potentially high-dimensional) covariates are employed to achieve the unconfoundedness but the parameters of interest are unconditional on the covariates. Unconditional parameters are simple to display and the simplicity is crucial especially when the covariates are high dimensional. As emphasized in Frölich and Melly (2013) and Powell (2010), unconditional parameters have two other attractive features. First, by definition, they capture all the individuals in the sample at the same time instead of investigating the underlying structure separately for each subgroup defined by the covariates X. The whole population is of interest to empirical researchers. Second, an estimator for unconditional parameters can have better finite/large sample properties.

We relate our estimands (the population objects that our procedure aims to recover) with the structural outcome function. Notably, we extend Hoderlein and Mammen (2007) and Sasaki (2015) to demonstrate that the unconditional derivative of the quantile of the potential outcome with respect to the treatment is equal to the weighted average of marginal effects.

This paper contributes to two strands of the econometric literature. The first is the literature on non-separable models with a continuous treatment, in which the previous analyses has focus on a fixed and small number of control variables, e.g., Hirano and Imbens (2004), Hoderlein and Mammen (2007), and Galvao and Wang (2015). The second is a growing literature on high-dimensional control variables. This paper is the most closely related to Belloni, Chernozhukov, Fernández-Val, and Hansen (2017), who considered estimation and inference of various causal effects when the treatment is *discrete*. We solve several challenges when we extend their idea of doubly robust moment conditions to a continuous treatment.

The treatment variable being continuous imposes difficulties in both variable selection and post-selection inference. For the variable selection, we propose to select controls by a hybrid of kernel regressions with Lasso, which requires a different penalty loading than the traditional one. To prove its validity, we establish a local version of the compatibility condition (Bühlmann and Van De Geer, 2011), which itself is new to the best of our knowledge. For the post-selection inference, we establish doubly robust moment conditions for the continuous treatment effect model, complementing the double robust estimation of treatment effect with discrete treatment. By averaging observations only around the treatment level of interest, the convergence rate of our estimators are nonparametric, which is in contrast with the $\sqrt{n}$-rate obtained in Belloni et al. (2017). To obtain uniformly valid results, we derive linear expansions of the rearrangement operator for a local process which is not tight and establish a new maximal inequality for the second order degenerate U-process, extending the existing results in Chernozhukov, Fernández-Val, and Galichon (2010) and Nolan and Pollard (1987), respectively.

We study a finite sample performance of our three-stage procedure via an empirical application and Monte Carlo simulations. In the empirical exercise, we estimate the Engel curve relationship (i.e., the effect of total expenditure on food share) using the 1995 U.K. Family Expenditure Survey. To control the endogeneity problem in the Engel curve, we use demographic variable as control variables. The estimated unconditional quantile function and its derivative intervals show a downward slope of the Engel curve, which is consistent with an intuition that food is an inferior good. By allowing for a high dimensional control variables, our inference procedure confirms the robustness of the previous results in the

literature (Lewbel, 2008).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the model and the parameters of interest. Section 3 proposes an estimation method in the presence of high-dimensional covariates. Section 4 demonstrates the validity of a bootstrap inference procedure. Section 5 presents Monte Carlo simulations. Section 6 analyzes the Engel curve relationship using the 1995 U.K. Family Expenditure Survey. Section 7 concludes. Proofs are reported in the appendix.

2 Model and parameters of interest

Econometricians observe outcome Y, a continuous treatment T, and a set of covariates X, which may be high dimensional. They are connected by a measurable function $\Gamma(\cdot)$, i.e.

$$Y = \Gamma(T, X, A),$$

in which A is an unobservable random vector and may not be weakly separable from observables (T, X), and Γ may not be monotone in either T or A.

Let $Y_t = \Gamma(t, X, A)$. We are interested in the average $\mathbb{E}Y_t$ and the quantile $q_\tau(t)$, where we denote $q_\tau(t)$ as the τ-th quantile of Y_t for some $\tau \in (0, 1)$. We can also estimate the causal effect of moving T from t to t', i.e. $\mathbb{E}(Y_t - Y_{t'})$ and $q_\tau(t) - q_\tau(t')$. Last, we are interested in the average marginal effect over all individuals with the same outcome, i.e. $\mathbb{E}[\partial_t \Gamma(t, X, A)|Y_t = q_\tau(t)]$. Next, we propose conditions under which the above parameters are identified.

Assumption 1. *The random variables A and T are conditionally independent given X.*

Assumption 1 is also known as the unconfoundedness, which is commonly assumed in the treatment effect literature. It is also called the conditional independence assumption in Hoderlein and Mammen (2007), which is weaker than full joint independence of A and T, X. Note that X can be arbitrarily correlated with unobservables A. This assumption is more plausible when we control for a sufficiently many and potentially high-dimensional covariates.

We also need some regularity conditions. Let $f_{T|X}(t|x)$ denote the conditional density of T evaluated at t given $X = x$. For brevity, we write $f_{T|X}(t|x)$ as $f_t(x)$. Similarly, we denote $f_{Y_t|X}(y|x)$, $f_{Y_t, \partial\Gamma(t,X,A)|X}(y, y'|x)$, and $f_{\partial\Gamma(t,X,A)|Y_t=q_\alpha(t),X}(y, y'|x)$ the conditional densities of Y_t given X, $(Y_t, \partial_t\Gamma(t, X, A))$ given X, and $\partial_t\Gamma(t, X, A)$ given $Y_t = q_\alpha(t)$ and X, respectively.

Assumption 2. *$\Gamma(t,x,a)$, $q_\alpha(t)$, and $f_{Y_t|X}(y|x)$ are continuously differentiable in t and all their derivatives are bounded for all $(x,a) \in \mathcal{XA}$ where $\mathcal{XA}$ is the joint support of (X,A) and y in a neighborhood of $q_\tau(t)$. $f_{Y_t,\partial\Gamma(t,X,A)|X}(y,y'|x)$ and $f_{\partial\Gamma(t,X,A)|Y_t=q_\alpha(t),X}(y,y'|x)$ exist and $f_{Y_t,\partial\Gamma(t,X,A)|X}(y,y'|x)$ is continuously differentiable in y with its derivative bounded for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is the support of X.*

Theorem 2.1. *If Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, then the marginal distribution of Y_t is identified and*

$$\partial_t q_\tau(t) = \mathbb{E}(\partial_t \Gamma(t,X,A)|Y_t = q_\tau(t)) = \mathbb{E}(\partial_t \Gamma(T,X,A)|T=t, Y = q_\tau(t)).$$

Several comments are in order. First, because the marginal distribution of Y_t is identified, so be its average, quantile, and causal effects defined above. Second, we can also view the model in the treatment effect framework with a continuous treatment. In this case, Y_t is the potential outcome. Under unconfoundednss, the identification of the marginal distribution of Y_t have already been established in Hirano and Imbens (2004) and Galvao and Wang (2015). The first part of Theorem 2.1 just re-states their results. Third, the second part of Theorem 2.1 is new to the literature. It is the unconditional version of Theorem 1 in Hoderlein and Mammen (2007). In particular, what is identified is the marginal effect $\partial_t \Gamma(T,X,A)$ averaged overall all individuals with same outcome $q_\tau(t)$ and treatment t but potentially different controls X and unobservables A.

3 Estimation

Based on Theorem 2.1, in the rest of the paper, we focus on estimating $q_\tau(t)$ and $\partial_t q_\tau(t)$, which represent the marginal distribution of Y_t and the average marginal effect, respective. Let $\delta_t(\cdot)$ be the Dirac function such that for any function $g(\cdot)$,

$$\int g(s)\delta_t(s)ds = g(t).$$

In addition, let $Y_{t,u} = \mathbb{1}\{Y_t \leq u\}$ and $Y_u = \mathbb{1}\{Y \leq u\}$ for some $u \in \Re$. Then $\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,u})$ can be identified by the method of generalized propensity score as proposed in Hirano and Imbens (2004), i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,u}) = \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{Y_u \delta_t(T)}{f_t(X)}\right). \tag{3.1}$$

There is a direct analogue between (3.1) for the continuous treatment and $\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,u}) = \mathbb{E}(\frac{Y_u \mathbb{1}\{T=t\}}{P(T=t|X)})$ when treatment status T is discrete: the indicator function shrinks to a Dirac function and the propensity score is replaced by the conditional density.

Belloni et al. (2017) considered the model with a discrete treatment and high-dimensional control variables and proposed to use the doubly robust moment for inference. Following their insight, we propose the corresponding doubly robust moment when the treatment status is continuous. Let $\phi_{t,u}(x) = \mathbb{E}(Y_u|X = x, T = t)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_{t,u}) = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{(Y_u - \phi_{t,u}(X))\delta_t(T)}{f_t(X)}\right) + \phi_{t,u}(X)\right]. \tag{3.2}$$

We propose the following five-step procedure to estimate $q_\tau(t)$ and $\partial_t q_\tau(t)$:

1. Estimate $\phi_{t,u}(x)$ and $f_t(x)$ by $\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(x)$ and $\hat{f}(t|x)$, respectively.
2. Estimate $\alpha(t,u) \equiv \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,u})$ by $\hat{\alpha}(t,u) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \left[\left(\frac{(Y_u - \widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(X_i))}{\hat{f}_t(X_i)h} K(\frac{T_i - t}{h})\right) + \widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(X_i)\right]$, where $K(\cdot)$ and h are a kernel function and a bandwidth, respectively.
3. Rearrange $\hat{a}(t,u)$ to obtain $\hat{a}^r(t,u)$, which is monotone in u.
4. Estimate $q_\tau(t)$ by inverting $\hat{a}^r(t,u)$ w.r.t. u, i.e. $\hat{q}_\tau(t) = \inf\{u : \hat{a}^r(t,u) \geq \tau\}$.
5. Estimate $\partial_t q_\tau(t)$ by $\hat{\beta}^1_\tau(t)$ which is the slope coefficient of the local linear regression of $\hat{q}_\tau(T_i)$ on $(1, T_i - t)$.

We call step 1 the first stage, steps 2–3 the second stage, and steps 4–5 the third stage. The next two sections analyze their statistical properties.

3.1 The first stage estimation

In this section, we define the first stage estimators and derive their asymptotic properties. Since both $\phi_{t,u}(x)$ and $f_t(x)$ are local parameters w.r.t. $T = t$, in addition to using l_1 penalty to select relevant covariates, we rely on a kernel function to implement the localization. In particular, we propose to estimate $\phi_{t,u}(x)$ and $f_t(x)$ by a penalized local maximal likelihood estimation (MLE) method and a penalized conditional density estimation method, respectively. Both methods are of their own interests.

3.1.1 Penalized local MLE

Recall $\phi_{t,u}(x) = \mathbb{E}(Y_u|X = x, T = t)$ where $Y_u = \mathbb{1}\{Y \leq u\}$. We approximate $\phi_{t,u}(x)$ by $\Lambda(f(x)'\theta_{t,u})$ where $\Lambda(\cdot)$ is the logistic CDF and $f(X)$ is a list of p-dimensional bases with $p \gg n$. In the high-dimensional setting, $f(X)$ is just X, while in the nonparametric setting, $f(X)$ is a series of bases of X. The approximation error $r^{\phi}_{t,u}(x) = \phi_{t,u}(x) - \Lambda(f(x)'\theta_{t,u})$.

We estimate $\phi_{t,u}(x)$ by $\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(x) = \Lambda(f(x)'\hat{\theta}_{t,u})$ where

$$\hat{\theta}_{t,u} = \arg\min_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^{n} M(\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \leq u\}, X_i; \theta) K(\frac{T_i - t}{h}) + \frac{\lambda}{n}|\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u}\theta|_1, \tag{3.3}$$

$\lambda = l_n(\log(p)nh)^{1/2}$ for some slowly diverging sequence l_n, and $M(y, x; \gamma) = -[y \log(\Lambda(f(x)'\gamma)) + (1 - y)\log(1 - \Lambda(f(x)'\gamma))]$. In (3.3), $\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u} = \text{diag}(l_{t,u,1}, \cdots, l_{t,u,p})$ is a generic penalty loading matrix. We follow the algorithm below to compute the penalty loading.

Algorithm 3.1. *Let $k = 0, 1, \cdots, K$. $\widehat{\Psi}^0_{t,u} = diag(l^0_{t,u,1}, \cdots, l^0_{t,u,p})$ where*

$$l^0_{t,u,j} = \left[\mathcal{P}_n Y_u^2 f_j^2(X) K(\frac{T - t}{h}) h^{-1}\right]^{1/2}.$$

Using $\widehat{\Psi}^0_{t,u}$, we can compute $\hat{\theta}^0_{t,u}$ and $\widehat{\phi}^0_{t,u}(X)$ by the penalized local maximal likelihood estimation. Then for $k = 1, \cdots, K$, we have $\widehat{\Psi}^k_{t,u} = diag(l^k_{t,u,1}, \cdots, l^k_{t,u,p})$ where

$$l^k_{t,u,j} = \left[\mathcal{P}_n (Y_u - \widehat{\phi}^{k-1}_{t,u}(X))^2 f_j^2(X) K(\frac{T - t}{h}) h^{-1}\right]^{1/2}.$$

The ideal loading matrix is $\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0} = \text{diag}(l_{t,u,0,1}, \cdots, l_{t,u,0,p})$ in which

$$l_{t,u,0,j} = \left[\mathcal{P}_n (Y_u - \phi_{t,u}(X))^2 f_j^2(X) K(\frac{T - t}{h}) h^{-1}\right]^{1/2}.$$

For each $(t, u) \in \mathcal{TU} \equiv \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{U}$ where $\mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{U}$ are compact subsets of the supports of T and Y, respectively, the Post-Lasso estimator of $\theta_{t,u}$ based on the set of covariates $\widetilde{T}_{t,u}$ is defined as

$$\tilde{\theta}_{t,u} \in \arg\min \sum_{i=1}^{n} M(\mathbb{1}\{Y_i \leq u\}, X_i; \theta) K(\frac{T_i - t}{h}), \quad s.t. \quad \text{Supp}(\theta) \in \widetilde{T}_{t,u},$$

where $\widetilde{T}_{t,u}$ contains the support of $\hat{\theta}_{t,u}$ and $|\widetilde{T}_{t,u}| \lesssim \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||\widehat{\theta}_{t,u}||_0$. The Post-Lasso estimator of $\phi_{t,u}(X)$ is $\widetilde{\phi}_{t,u}(X) = \Lambda(f(X)'\tilde{\theta}_{t,u})$.

3.1.2 Penalized conditional density estimation

Following the idea of Fan, Yao, and Tong (1996), $\mathbb{E}(\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h})|X) = f_t(X) + O(h^2)$. We approximate $f_t(x)$ by $f(x)'\beta_t$ for some β_t. The approximation error is denoted as $r_t^f(x) = f_t(x) - f(x)'\beta_t$. we estimate β_t and $f_t(X)$ by

$$\hat{\beta}_t = \arg\min_{\beta} ||\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - f(X)'\beta||^2_{P_n,2} + \frac{\lambda}{nh}||\widehat{\Psi}_t\beta||_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{f}_t(X) = f(X)'\hat{\beta}_t, \quad \text{respectively.}$$

$\Lambda = l_n(\log(p)nh)^{1/2}$ and $\widehat{\Psi}_t = \text{diag}(l_{t,1}, \cdots, l_{t,p})$ is a generic penalty loading matrix. We follow the algorithm below to compute the penalty loading.

Algorithm 3.2. *Let $k = 0, 1, \cdots, K$. $\widehat{\Psi}_t^0 = diag(l_{t,1}^0, \cdots, l_{t,p}^0)$ where*

$$l_{t,j}^0 = ||h^{-1/2}K(\frac{T-t}{h})f_j(X)||_{P_n,2}.$$

Using $\widehat{\Psi}_t^0$, we can compute $\hat{\beta}_t^0$ and $\hat{f}_t^0(X)$ by the penalized conditional density estimation. Then for $k = 1, \cdots, K$, we have $\widehat{\Psi}_t^k = diag(l_{t,1}^k, \cdots, l_{t,p}^k)$ where

$$l_{t,j}^k = h^{1/2}||(h^{-1}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - \hat{f}_t^{k-1}(X))f_j(X)||_{P_n,2}.$$

The ideal penalty loading matrix is $\widehat{\Psi}_{t,0} = \text{diag}(l_{t,0,1}, \cdots, l_{t,0,p})$ where

$$l_{t,0,j} = h^{1/2}||(h^{-1}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - f_t(X))f_j(X)||_{P_n,2}.$$

For each $t \in \mathcal{T}$, the Post-Lasso estimator of β_t based on the set of covariates $\widetilde{T}_t$ is defined as

$$\tilde{\beta}_t \in \arg\min ||\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - f(X)'\beta||^2_{P_n,2}, \quad s.t. \quad \text{Supp}(\beta) \in \widetilde{T}_t$$

where $\widetilde{T}_t$ contains the support of $\hat{\beta}_t$ and $|\widetilde{T}_t| \lesssim \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\beta}_t||_0$. The Post-Lasso estimator of $f_t(X)$ is $\tilde{f}_t(X) = f(X)'\tilde{\beta}_t$.

3.1.3 Asymptotic properties of the first stage estimators

Assumption 3. *Uniformly over* $(t,u) \in \mathcal{TU}$,

1. $\max(||\beta_t||_0, ||\theta_{t,u}||_0) \leq s$ *for some* s *which possibly depends on the sample size* n.
2. $||r_t^f(X)||_{P_n,2} = O_p((s\log(p)/(nh))^{1/2})$ *and* $||r_{t,u}^{\phi}(X)K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} = O_p((s\log(p)/n)^{1/2})$.
3. $||r_t^f(X)||_{P,\infty} = O((\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh))^{1/2})$, $||r_{t,u}^{\phi}(X)||_{P,\infty} = O((\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh))^{1/2})$.

Assumption 4.

1. $K(\cdot)$ *is a symmetric PDF with* $\int uK(u)du = 0$ *and* $\int u^2K(u)du = \nu < \infty$.
2. $h = C_hn^{-H}$ *with* $H \in (1/4, 1/3)$ *and some positive constant* C_h.
3. *There exists some positive constant* $\underline{C} < 1$ *such that* $\underline{C} \leq f_t(x) \leq 1/\underline{C}$ *uniformly over* $(t,x) \in \mathcal{TX}$, *where* $\mathcal{TX}$ *is the support of* $f_T(X)$ *for* $T \in \mathcal{T}$.
4. *For the same* $\underline{C}$ *as above,* $\underline{C} \leq \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,u}|X = x) \leq 1 - \underline{C}$ *uniformly over* $(t,x,u) \in \mathcal{TXU} \equiv \mathcal{TX} \times \mathcal{U}$.
5. $\phi_{t,u}(x)$ *is three times differentiable w.r.t.* t *with all three derivatives bounded uniformly over* $(t,x,u) \in \mathcal{TXU}$.

Assumption 5. *There exists a sequence* $l_n \to \infty$ *such that, with probability approaching one,*

$$0 < \kappa' \leq \inf_{\delta \neq 0, ||\delta||_0 \leq sl_n} \frac{||f(X)'\delta||_{P_n,2}}{||\delta||_2} \leq \sup_{\delta \neq 0, ||\delta||_0 \leq sl_n} \frac{||f(X)'\delta||_{P_n,2}}{||\delta||_2} \leq \kappa'' < \infty.$$

Assumption 6.

1. $||\max_{j \leq p}|f_j(X)|||_{P,\infty} \leq K_n$ *and* $\underline{C} \leq \mathbb{E}f_j(X)^2 \leq 1/\underline{C}$ $j = 1, \cdots, p$.
2. $K_n^2s^2l_n^2\log(p)/(nh) \to 0$.

Since there is a kernel in the Lasso objective function in (3.3), the asymptotic properties of $\hat{\theta}_{t,u}$ cannot be established by directly applying the results in Belloni et al. (2017). The key missing piece is the following local version of the compatibility condition. Let $\omega_{t,u}(X) = \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,u}|X)(1 - \mathbb{E}(Y_{t,u}|X))$, $T_{t,u}$ be the support of $\theta_{t,u}$, and $\Delta_{c,t,u} = \{\delta : ||\delta_{T_{t,u}^c}||_1 \leq c||\delta_{T_{t,u}}||_1\}$ for some $c < \infty$.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists* $\underline{k} = \kappa' \underline{C}^{1/2}/4 > 0$ *such that, for* n *sufficiently large, w.p.a.1,*

$$\inf_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} \inf_{\delta\in\Delta_{c,t,u}} \frac{||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}}{||\delta_{T_{t,u}}||_2\sqrt{h}} \geq \underline{\kappa}.$$

Based on Lemma 3.1, the following theorem bounds

$$||\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(X) - \phi_{t,u}(X)||_{P,\infty} \quad \text{and} \quad ||(\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(X) - \phi_{t,u}(X))K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}.$$

Theorem 3.1. *If Assumption 3–6 hold, then*

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||(\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(X) - \phi_{t,u}(X))K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} = O_p(l_n(\log(p)s)^{1/2}n^{-1/2}),$$

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(X) - \phi_{t,u}(X)||_{P,\infty} = O_p(l_n(\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh))^{1/2}) \quad w.p.a.1,$$

and $\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||\hat{\theta}_{t,u}||_0 = O_p(s)$ *where* $\hat{s}_{t,u} = ||\hat{\theta}_{t,u}||_0$.

For the penalized conditional density estimation, the kernel function will not affect the bases. Therefore, the usual compatibility condition suffices.

Theorem 3.2. *If Assumption 3–6 hold, then* $\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\hat{\beta}_t||_0 = O_p(s)$,

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\hat{f}_t(X) - f_t(X)||_{P_n,2} = O_p(l_n(\log(p)s/(nh))^{1/2}),$$

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\hat{\beta}_t - \beta_t||_1 = O_p(l_n(\log(p)s^2/(nh))^{1/2}),$$

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\tilde{f}_t(X) - f_t(X)||_{P_n,2} = O_p(l_n(\log(p)s/(nh))^{1/2}),$$

and

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\tilde{f}_t(X) - f_t(X)||_{P,\infty} = O_p(l_n(\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh))^{1/2}).$$

3.2 The second stage estimation

Let $W_u = \{Y_u, T, X\}$. For two generic functions $\breve{\phi}(\cdot)$ and $\breve{f}(\cdot)$ of X, denote $\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \breve{\phi}, \breve{f}) = \frac{(Y_u - \breve{\phi}(X))}{\breve{f}(X)h} K(\frac{T-t}{h}) + \breve{\phi}(X)$. Then the estimator $\hat{\alpha}(t,u)$ can be written as

$$\hat{\alpha}(t,u) = \mathcal{P}_n \Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \overline{\phi}_{t,u}, \overline{f}_t)$$

where $\overline{\phi}_{t,u}(\cdot)$ and $\overline{f}_t(\cdot)$ are either the Lasso estimators (i.e. $\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{f}_t(\cdot)$) or the post-Lasso estimators (i.e. $\widetilde{\phi}_{t,u}(\cdot)$ and $\tilde{f}_t(\cdot)$) as defined in Section 3.1.

Assumption 7. *1.* $l_n^4 s^2 \log(p)^2/(nh) \to 0$. *2.* $l_n^4 s^2 \log(p)^2/(nh^2) \to 0$.

Theorem 3.3. *If Assumption 1–6 and 7.1 hold, then*

$$\hat{\alpha}(t,u) - \alpha(t,u) = (\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \phi_{t,u}, f_t) + R_n(t,u),$$

where

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} R_n(t,u) = o_p((nh)^{-1/2}).$$

If Assumption 7.1 is replaced by Assumption 7.2, then

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} R_n(t,u) = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

3.3 The third stage estimation

Recall that $q_\tau(t)$ is the τ-th quantile of Y_t which is the inverse of $\alpha(t,u)$ w.r.t. u. We propose to estimate $q_\tau(t)$ by $\hat{q}_\tau(t)$ where $\hat{q}_\tau(t) = \inf\{u : \hat{\alpha}^r_{t,u} \geq \tau\}$, where $\hat{\alpha}^r_{t,u}$ is the rearrangement of $\hat{\alpha}(t,u)$.

We rearrange $\hat{\alpha}(t,u)$ to make it monotonically increasing in $u \in \mathcal{U}$. Following Chernozhukov et al. (2010), we define $\overline{Q} = Q \circ \psi^{\leftarrow}$ where ψ is any increasing bijective mapping: $\mathcal{U} \mapsto [0,1]$. Then the rearrangement $\overline{Q}^r$ of $\overline{Q}$ is defined as

$$\overline{Q}^r(u) = F^{\leftarrow}(u) = \inf\{y : F(y) \geq u\},$$

where $F(y) = \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{\overline{Q}(u) \leq y\}du$. Then the rearrangement Q^r for Q is

$$Q^r = \overline{Q}^r \circ \psi(u).$$

The rearrangement and inverse are two functionals operating on the process

$$\{\hat{\alpha}(t,u) : (t,u) \in \mathcal{TU}\}$$

and are shown to be Hadamard differentiable by Chernozhukov et al. (2010) and Van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), respectively. However, by Theorem 3.3,

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} (nh)^{1/2}(\hat{\alpha}(t,u) - \alpha(t,u)) = O_p(\log^{1/2}(n)),$$

which is not asymptotically tight. Therefore, the standard functional delta method used in Chernozhukov et al. (2010) and Van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) is not directly applicable. The next theorem overcomes this difficulty and establishes the linear expansion of the quantile estimator. Denote $\mathcal{TI}$, $\{q_\tau(t) : \tau \in \mathcal{I}\}^\varepsilon$, $\overline{\{q_\tau(t) : \tau \in \mathcal{I}\}^\varepsilon}$, and $\mathcal{U}_t$ as $\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{I}$, the ε-enlarged set of $\{q_\tau(t) : \tau \in \mathcal{I}\}$, the closure of $\{q_\tau(t) : \tau \in \mathcal{I}\}^\varepsilon$, and the projection of $\mathcal{TU}$ on $T = t$, respectively.

Theorem 3.4. *If Assumption 1–6, 7.1 hold and for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$,*

$$\overline{\{q_\tau(t) : \tau \in \mathcal{I}\}^\varepsilon} \subset \mathcal{U}_t,$$

then

$$\hat{q}_\tau(t) - q_\tau(t) = -(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})\Pi_{t,u}(W_{q_\tau(t)}, \phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}, f_t)/f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t)) + R_n^q(t,\tau),$$

where f_{Y_t} is the density of Y_t and

$$\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}} R_n^q(t,\tau) = o_p((nh)^{-1/2}).$$

If Assumption 7.1 is replaced by Assumption 7.2, then

$$\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}} R_n^q(t,\tau) = o_p((n)^{-1/2}).$$

Given the estimator $\hat{q}_\tau(t)$, we can run a local linear regression of $\hat{q}_\tau(T_i)$ on $(1, (T_i - t))$ and

obtain the estimator $\hat{\beta}^1_\tau(t)$ of $\partial_t q_\tau(t)$ as the linear coefficient in front of $(T_i - t)$. In particular, we define

$$(\hat{\beta}^0_\tau(t), \hat{\beta}^1_\tau(t)) = \arg\max_{\beta^0, \beta^1} (\hat{q}_\tau(T_i) - \beta^0 - \beta^1(T_i - t))^2 K(\frac{T_i - t}{h}).$$

Theorem 3.5. *If Assumptions 1–6, 7.2 hold for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$,*

$$\overline{\{q_\tau(t) : \tau \in \mathcal{I}\}}^{\varepsilon} \subset \mathcal{U}_t,$$

then

$$\hat{\beta}^1_\tau(t) - \partial_t q_\tau(t) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (\kappa_2 f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t)) f_t(X_j) h^2)^{-1} \left[Y_{q_\tau(t),j} - \phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j) \right] \overline{K}(\frac{T_j - t}{h}) + R^1_n(t, \tau),$$

where $\sup_{(t,\tau) \in \mathcal{TI}} |R^1_n(t, \tau)| = o_p((nh^3)^{-1/2})$ *and* $\overline{K}(v) = \int wK(v - w)K(w)dw$.

4 Inference

We conduct the bootstrap inference. Let $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables generated from the distribution of η.

Assumption 8. *η has sub-exponential tails*[3] *and unit mean and variance.*

The above assumption is standard for bootstrap inference. For example, η can be a standard exponential random variable or a normal random variable with unit mean and standard deviation. We conduct the bootstrap inference based on the following procedure.

1. Obtain $\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(x)$, $\hat{f}(t|x)$, $\widetilde{\phi}_{t,u}(x)$ and $\tilde{f}(t|x)$ from the first stage.
2. For the b-th bootstrap sample:
   - Generate $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^n$ from the distribution of η.
   - Compute $\hat{\alpha}^b(t, u) = \mathcal{P}_n \eta \Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \overline{\phi}_{t,u}, \overline{f}_t) \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i \Pi_{t,u}(W_{ui}, \overline{\phi}_{t,u}, \overline{f}_t)$, where $(\overline{\phi}_{t,u}(\cdot), \overline{f}_t(\cdot))$ are either $(\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(\cdot), \hat{f}_t(\cdot))$ or $(\widetilde{\phi}_{t,u}(\cdot), \tilde{f}_t(\cdot))$.
   - Rearrange $\hat{\alpha}^b(t, u)$ and obtain $\hat{\alpha}^{br}(t, u)$.
   - Invert $\hat{a}^{br}(t, u)$ w.r.t. u and obtain $\hat{q}^b_\tau(t) = \inf\{u : \hat{a}^{br}(t, u) \geq \tau\}$.

[3] A random variable η has usb-exponential tails if $P(|\eta| > x) \leq K \exp(-Cx)$ for every x and some constants K and C

- Compute $\hat{\beta}_\tau^{b1}(t)$ which is the slope coefficient of the local linear regression of $\eta_i \hat{q}_\tau^b(T_i)$ on $(\eta_i, \eta_i(T_i - t))$.

3. We repeat the above step for $b = 1, \cdots, B$ and obtain a bootstrap sample of $\{\hat{q}_\tau^b(t), \hat{\beta}_\tau^{b1}(t)\}_{b=1}^B$.

4. Obtain $\widehat{Q}^0(\alpha)$ and $\widehat{Q}^1(\alpha)$ as the α-th quantile of the sequence $\{\hat{q}_\tau^b(t) - \hat{q}_\tau(t)\}_{b=1}^B$ and $\{\hat{\beta}_\tau^{b1}(t) - \hat{\beta}_\tau^1(t)\}_{b=1}^B$, respectively.

Theorem 4.1. *If assumptions in Theorem 3.4 and Assumption 8 hold, then*

$$P(\widehat{Q}^0(\alpha/2) \leq q_\tau(t) \leq \widehat{Q}^0(1-\alpha/2)) \to 1-\alpha.$$

If assumptions in Theorem 3.5 and Assumption 8 hold, then

$$P(\widehat{Q}^1(\alpha/2) \leq \partial_t q_\tau(t) \leq \widehat{Q}^1(1-\alpha/2)) \to 1-\alpha.$$

5 Monte Carlo simulations

This section presents the results of Monte Carlo simulations, which demonstrate the finite sample performance of the estimation and inference procedure. We modify the simulation designs of Belloni et al. (2017) to a continuous treatment model as follows. Y and T are generated via

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \Phi\left(C^{-1}\left(c_t \sum_{j=1}^p j^{-2} X_j + V\right)\right) \\ Y &= \Phi\left(3((T-0.5) + 0.5(T-0.5)^2) + c_y \sum_{j=1}^p j^{-2} X_j + U\right), \end{aligned}$$

where U and V are independent standard normal random vairables, $p = 100$, X is a p-dimensional normal random variable with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance $[2^{-|j-k|}]_{jk}$, and $C = sd\left(c_t \sum_{j=1}^p j^{-2} X_j + V\right)$. We set the parameter value $(c_t, c_y) = (.5, .5)$ for the Monte Carlo simulation.[4]

[4]We have tried several other parameter values. The results are similar to the result for $(c_t, c_y) = (.5, .5)$, and are available from the authors upon request.

We have two tuning parameters, h and l_n. First, our definition of h is based on Yu and Jones (1998), which gives the rule-of-thumb bandwidth $h_{rt} = 1.095 \times 1.08 \times sd(T) \times n^{-1/5}$ for the local median regression. Since our theoretical results requires that the convergence rate of h is between $n^{-1/4}$ and $n^{-1/3}$, however, we need to make h to be an under-smoothed bandwidth. We define $h = n^{-1/10} \times h_{rt}$, where our choice of $n^{-1/10}$ follows Cai and Xiao (2012, p.418). For l_n, we define $l_n = \sqrt{\log(\log(n))}$ based on our simulation experiences.
Figure 1 draws the true unconditional quantile function and its derivative for $\tau = 50\%$. Figure 2 describes the coverage probabilities of 90% bootstrap confidence intervals for the unconditional quantile function. The coverage probability is calculated as how often the confidence interval include the true value of the unconditional quantile out of 2000 simulations. The calculation is done separately for each treatment value t. The figure shows that the coverage rate is close to the specified level of 90% around $t \in (0.1, 0.9)$, which confirms theoretical results in the previous section. Figure 3 shows the coverage probabilities for the derivatives of the unconditional quantile function. Although the estimator for the derivative has a slower rate of the convergence than the unconditional quantile function itself, the coverage probabilities for the estimated derivatives are still close to the specified level of 90%.

6 Application: Engel curve estimation

We consider the estimation of the Engel curve relationship, that is, the regression of food share on total expenditure. The relationship has been econometrically investigated in various contexts.[5] Here the sample is taken from the 1995 U.K. Family Expenditure Survey (FES). Following the previous usages of this dataset (Blundell, Chen, and Kristensen 2007; Imbens and Newey 2009; and Chernozhukov, Fernández-Val, and Kowalski 2015), we use only the individuals who married/cohabitating with at most two children and whose household head is employed and between 20 and 50 years old. The resulting sample size is 1,655.
The outcome variable of interest is the logarithm of the food share within the total expenditure. The food share is positive, so it is not subject to the censoring issues (Chernozhukov et al., 2015). The treatment variable is the logarithm of the total expenditure. In this section, we use demographic variables as control variables. The list includes the indicator of having kids and the household income. Since we do not know ex ante how these covariates affect the other variables, we create many control variables by constructing B-spines from

[5] See Lewbel (2008) for a brief review on this topic.



Figure 1: True unconditional quantile function (green line) and its derivatives (blue line)

income and interacting them with the kid indicator, where we use third order polynomials and 19 knots of $5, 10, \ldots, 95$ percentiles. The resulting number of control variables is 160. Figures 4-6 show the estimated unconditional quantile functions and its confidence intervals for $\tau = 25\%, 50\%, 75\%$. For all the three quantile indices, we observe a negative slope of the unconditional quantile function, which means that food is an inferior good. Figures 7-9 are the results for the derivatives of the unconditional quantile function. Although the 95% confidence intervals include 0 for some values of t, the estimated derivatives confirms the result of food being an inferior good.



Figure 2: Coverage probabilities for the unconditional quantile function

7 Conclusion

This paper studies non-separable models with a continuous treatment and high-dimensional control variables. It extends the existing results on the causal inference in non-separable models to the case with both continuous treatment and high-dimensional covariates. It develops a method based on localized L_1-penalization to select covariates at each value of the continuous treatment. It then proposes a multi-stage estimation and inference procedure for average, quantile, and marginal treatment effects. Our simulation and empirical exercises supports the theoretical results in finite sample.



Figure 3: Coverage probabilities for the derivative of the unconditional quantile function

References

Altonji, J. G. and Matzkin, R. L. (2005), "Cross section and panel data estimators for nonseparable models with endogenous regressors," *Econometrica*, 73, 1053–1102.

Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., Fernández-Val, I., and Hansen, C. (2017), "Program Evaluation with High-dimensional Data," *Econometrica*, 85, 233–298.

Bickel, P. J., Ritov, Y., and Tsybakov, A. B. (2009), "Simultaneous Analysis of Lasso and Dantzig Selector," *The Annals of Statistics*, 37, 1705–1732.

Blundell, R., Chen, X., and Kristensen, D. (2007), "Semi-Nonparametric IV Estimation of Shape-Invariant Engel Curves," *Econometrica*, 75, 1613–1669.



Figure 4: Data (red points), the estimated unconditional quantile function at $\tau = 25\%$ (blue line), and its confidence interval (green line)

Browning, M. and Carro, J. (2007), "Heterogeneity and microeconometrics modeling," *Econometric Society Monographs*, 43, 47.

Bühlmann, P. and Van De Geer, S. (2011), *Statistics for high-dimensional data: methods, theory and applications*, Springer Science & Business Media.

Cai, Z. and Xiao, Z. (2012), "Semiparametric quantile regression estimation in dynamic models with partially varying coefficients," *Journal of Econometrics*, 167, 413 – 425, Fourth Symposium on Econometric Theory and Applications (SETA).

Chernozhukov, V., Fernández-Val, I., and Galichon, A. (2010), "Quantile and Probability Curves without Crossing," *Econometrica*, 78, 1093–1125.



Figure 5: Data (red points), the estimated unconditional quantile function at $\tau = 50\%$ (blue line), and its confidence interval (green line)

Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., and Kato, K. (2014), "Gaussian Approximation of Suprema of Empirical Processes," *The Annals of Statistics*, 42, 1564–1597.

Chernozhukov, V., Fernández-Val, I., and Kowalski, A. E. (2015), "Quantile regression with censoring and endogeneity," *Journal of Econometrics*, 186, 201–221.

Fan, J., Yao, Q., and Tong, H. (1996), "Estimation of Conditional Densities and Sensitivity Measures in Nonlinear Dynamical Systems," *Biometrika*, 83, 189–206.

Frölich, M. and Melly, B. (2013), "Unconditional quantile treatment effects under endogeneity," *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 31, 346–357.

Galvao, A. F. and Wang, L. (2015), "Uniformly Semiparametric Efficient Estimation of



Figure 6: Data (red points), the estimated unconditional quantile function at $\tau = 75\%$ (blue line), and its confidence interval (green line)

Treatment Effects with a continuous treatment," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110, 1528–1542.

Hirano, K. and Imbens, G. W. (2004), "The propensity score with continuous treatments," *in Applied Bayesian Modeling and Causal Inference from Incomplete-Data Perspectives, ed. A. Gelman and X.-L. Meng*, 226164, 73–84.

Hoderlein, S. and Mammen, E. (2007), "Identification of Marginal Effects in Nonseparable Models without Monotonicity," *Econometrica*, 75, 1513–1518.

Imbens, G. W. and Newey, W. K. (2009), "Identification and Estimation of Triangular Simultaneous Equations Models Without Additivity," *Econometrica*, 77, 1481–1512.



Figure 7: DesignData (red points), the estimated derivative of the unconditional quantile function at $\tau = 25\%$ (blue line), and its confidence interval (green line)

Ledoux, M. and Talagrand, M. (2013), *Probability in Banach Spaces: Isoperimetry and Processes*, Springer Science & Business Media.

Lewbel, A. (2008), "Engel curves," *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, 2.

Nolan, D. and Pollard, D. (1987), "U-processes: Rates of Convergence," *The Annals of Statistics*, 15, 780–799.

Powell, D. (2010), "Unconditional quantile regression for panel data with exogenous or endogenous regressors," *Working paper*.

Rosenbaum, P. R. and Rubin, D. B. (1983), "The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects," *Biometrika*, 70, 41–55.



Figure 8: DesignData (red points), the estimated derivative of the unconditional quantile function at $\tau = 50\%$ (blue line), and its confidence interval (green line)

Sasaki, Y. (2015), "What do quantile regressions identify for general structural functions?" *Econometric Theory*, 31, 1102–1116.

Van der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996), *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes: With Applications to Statistics*, Springer.

Yu, K. and Jones, M. (1998), "Local linear quantile regression," *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 93, 228–237.



Figure 9: DesignData (red points), the estimated derivative of the unconditional quantile function at $\tau = 75\%$ (blue line), and its confidence interval (green line)

A Proof of Theorem 2.1

For the marginal distribution of Y_t, we note that, by Assumption 1,

$$P(Y_t \leq u) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}(\mathbb{1}\{Y_t \leq u\}|X, T = t)].$$

For the second result, we note that, by definition of $q_\tau(t)$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathbb{E}P(Y \leq q_\tau(t+\delta)|T = t+\delta, X) - \mathbb{E}P(Y \leq q_\tau(t)|T = t, X) \\ &= I + II + III, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
I =& \mathbb{E}P(\phi(t+\delta, X, A) \leq q_\alpha(t+\delta)|T = t+\delta, X) - \mathbb{E}P(\phi(t+\delta, X, A) \leq q_\tau(t)|T = t+\delta, X) \\
II =& \mathbb{E}P(\phi(t+\delta, X, A) \leq q_\tau(t)|T = t+\delta, X) - \mathbb{E}P(\phi(t+\delta, X, A) \leq q_\tau(t)|T = t, X) \\
III =& \mathbb{E}P(\phi(t+\delta, X, A) \leq q_\tau(t)|T = t, X) - \mathbb{E}P(\phi(t, X, A) \leq q_\tau(t)|T = t, X).
\end{aligned}
$$

By Assumption 1, $II = 0$. For I, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
I =& \mathbb{E}P(\phi(t+\delta, X, A) \leq q_\alpha(t+\delta)|X) - \mathbb{E}P(\phi(t+\delta, X, A) \leq q_\tau(t)|X) \\
=& \mathbb{E}\int_{q_\tau(t)}^{q_\alpha(t+\delta)} f_{Y_{t+\delta}|X}(y|X)dy \\
=& \delta\partial_t q_\tau(t)\mathbb{E}f_{Y_t|X}(q_\tau(t)|X) + o(\delta) \\
=& \delta\partial_t q_\tau(t) f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t)) + o(\delta).
\end{aligned}
$$

For III, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
III =& \mathbb{E}P(q_\tau(t) \leq Y \leq q_\tau(t) + Y - \phi(t+\delta, X, A)|T = t, X) \\
& - \mathbb{E}P(q_\tau(t) + Y - \phi(t+\delta, X, A) \leq Y \leq q_\tau(t)|T = t, X) \\
=& \mathbb{E}P(q_\tau(t) \leq Y \leq q_\tau(t) - \delta\partial_t\phi(t, X, A)|T = t, X) \\
& - \mathbb{E}P(q_\tau(t) - \delta\partial_t\phi(t, X, A) \leq Y \leq q_\tau(t)|T = t, X) + o(\delta).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}
$$

For the first term in the RHS of (A.1), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}P(q_\tau(t) \leq Y \leq q_\tau(t) - \delta\partial_t\phi(t, X, A)|T = t, X) \\
=& \mathbb{E}P(Y_t \geq q_\tau(t), \partial_t\phi(t, X, A) \leq -\frac{Y_t - q_\tau(t)}{\delta}|X) \\
=& \mathbb{E}\int_{q_\tau(t)}^{\infty}\int_{-\infty}^{-[y-q_\tau(t)]/\delta} f_{Y_t, \partial_t\phi(t,X,A)|X}(y, y'|X)dy'dy \\
=& \delta\mathbb{E}\int_{-\infty}^{0}\int_{-\infty}^{u} f_{Y_t, \partial_t\phi(t,X,A)|X}(q_\tau(t) - \delta u, y'|X)dy'du \\
=& \delta\mathbb{E}\int_{-\infty}^{0}\int_{y'}^{0} f_{Y_t, \partial_t\phi(t,X,A)|X}(q_\tau(t) - \delta u, y'|X)dudy' \\
=& \delta\mathbb{E}\int_{-\infty}^{0}(-y') f_{Y_t, \partial_t\phi(t,X,A)|X}(q_\tau(t), y'|X)dy' + o(\delta) \\
=& \delta\mathbb{E}\int_{-\infty}^{0}(-y') f_{\partial_t\phi(t,X,A)|Y_t=q_\tau(t),X}(y')dy' f_{Y_t|X}(q_\tau(t)|X) + o(\delta)
\end{aligned}
$$

Similarly, the second term of (A.1) is

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}P(q_\tau(t)+\partial_t\phi(t,X,A)\leq Y\leq q_\tau(t)|T=t,X)\\=&\delta\mathbb{E}\int_0^\infty y' f_{\partial_t\phi(t,X,A)|Y_t=q_\tau(t),X}(y')dy' f_{Y_t|X}(q_\tau(t)|X)+o(\delta)\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$III=-\delta\mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}(\partial_t\phi(t,X,A)|Y_t=q_\tau(t),X)f_{Y_t|X}(q_\tau(t)|X)\Big]+o(\delta).$$

Since $I+II+III=0$, by letting $\delta\to 0$, we have

$$\partial_t q_\tau(t) f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t))=\mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}(\partial_t\phi(t,X,A)|Y_t=q_\tau(t),X)f_{Y_t|X}(q_\tau(t)|X)\Big].$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t q_\tau(t)=&\mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}(\partial_t\phi(t,X,A)|Y_t=q_\tau(t),X)\frac{f_{Y_t|X}(q_\tau(t)|X)}{f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t))}\Big]\\=&\mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbb{E}(\partial_t\phi(t,X,A)|Y_t=q_\tau(t),X)\Big|Y_t=q_\tau(t)\Big]\\=&\mathbb{E}(\partial_t\phi(t,X,A)|Y_t=q_\tau(t))\\=&\mathbb{E}(\partial_t\phi(T,X,A)|Y=q_\tau(t),T=t)\end{aligned}$$

B Proof of Lemma 3.1

Note that $\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}\geq \underline{C}(1-\underline{C})>0$ uniformly over $(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}$. So we focus on finding the lower bound for $\frac{||f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}}{||\delta_{T_{t,u}}||_2}$ when $\delta\in\Delta_{c,t,u}$. In addition, by Assumption 5, we can work on the set such that

$$\left\{\{X\}_{i=1}^n:\sup_{|\delta|_0\leq sl_n}\frac{||f(X)'\delta||_{P_n,2}}{||\delta||_2}\leq\kappa''<\infty.\right\}$$

On this set, $\sup_{|\delta|_0\leq sl_n}\frac{\mathbb{E}|f(X)'\delta|^2}{||\delta||_2^2}\leq(\kappa'')^2$.

We use the same partition as in Bickel, Ritov, and Tsybakov (2009). Let $T_0=T_{t,u}$ and $m\geq s$ be an integer which will be specified later. Partition $T_{t,u}^c$, the complement of $T_{t,u}$, as $\sum_{l=1}^L T_l$ such that $|T_l|=m$ for $l<L$, $|T_L|\leq m$, where T_l, for $l<L$, contains the indices corresponding to m largest in absolute value of δ outside $\cup_{j=0}^{l-1}T_j$ and T_L collects the

remaining indices. Further denote $\delta_j = \delta_{T_j}$ and $\delta_{01} = \delta_{T_0 \cup T_1}$. Then

$$||f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} \geq ||f(X)'\delta_{01}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} - \sum_{l=2}^{L} ||f(X)'\delta_l K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}. \tag{B.1}$$

For the first term on the RHS, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&||f(X)'\delta_{01}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||^2_{P_n,2} \\
\geq &||f(X)'\delta_{01}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||^2_{P,2} - |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})(f(X)'\delta_{01})^2 K(\frac{T-t}{h})| \\
\geq &\underline{C}h||f(X)'\delta_{01}||^2_{P,2} - |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})(f(X)'\delta_{01})^2 K(\frac{T-t}{h})| \\
\geq &\underline{C}h||f(X)'\delta_{01}||^2_{P_n,2} - \underline{C}h|(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})(f(X)'\delta_{01})^2| - |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})(f(X)'\delta_{01})^2 K(\frac{T-t}{h})|
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

where the second inequality holds because

$$\mathbb{E}(f(X)'\delta_{01})^2 K(\frac{T-t}{h}) = h\mathbb{E}(f(X)'\delta_{01})^2 \int f_{t+hu}(X)K(u)du \geq \underline{C}h\mathbb{E}(f(X)'\delta_{01})^2.$$

We next bound the last term on the RHS. The second term can be bounded in a same manner. Let $\tilde{\delta}_{01} = \delta_{01}/||\delta_{01}||_2$. Then we have

$$|(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})(f(X)'\delta_{01})^2 K(\frac{T-t}{h})| = ||\delta_{01}||_2^2 |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})(f(X)'\tilde{\delta}_{01})^2 K(\frac{T-t}{h})|.$$

In addition, let $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be a sequence of Rademacher random variables which is independent of the data and $\mathcal{F} = \{\eta f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h}) : ||\delta||_0 = m+s, ||\delta||_2 = 1, t \in \mathcal{T}\}$ with envelope

$F = K_n(m+s)^{1/2}$. Denote π_{1n} as $\frac{\log(p\vee n)(s+m)^2K_n^2}{nh}$ with $m = sl_n^{1/2}$. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\sup_{||\tilde{\delta}_{01}||_0\leq m+s,||\tilde{\delta}_{01}||_2=1,t\in\mathcal{T}}|(\mathcal{P}_n-\mathcal{P})(f(X)'\tilde{\delta}_{01})^2K(\frac{T-t}{h})|\\
\leq&2\mathbb{E}\sup_{||\tilde{\delta}_{01}||_0\leq m+s,||\tilde{\delta}_{01}||_2=1,t\in\mathcal{T}}|\mathcal{P}_n\eta(f(X)'\tilde{\delta}_{01})^2K(\frac{T-t}{h})|\\
\leq&2K_n\left(\sup_{||\tilde{\delta}_{01}||_0\leq m+s,||\tilde{\delta}_{01}||_2=1}||\tilde{\delta}_{01}||_1\right)\left(\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}|\mathcal{P}_n\eta f|\right)\\
\lesssim&2K_n(m+s)^{1/2}\left[(\frac{\log(p\vee n)(s+m)h}{n})^{1/2}+\frac{K_n(m+s)^{1/2}\log(p)(s+m)}{n}\right]\\
\lesssim&\left(\frac{\log(p\vee n)(s+m)^2hK_n^2}{n}\right)^{1/2}=h\pi_{1n},
\end{aligned}
$$

where the first inequality is by Lemma 2.3.1 in Van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), the second inequality is by Theorem 4.4 in Ledoux and Talagrand (2013), and the third one is by applying Corollary 5.1 of Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2014) with $\sigma^2 = \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}\mathbb{E}f^2 \lesssim h$ and, for some $A \geq e$,

$$
\sup_Q N(\mathcal{F}, e_Q, \varepsilon||F||_{Q,2}) \leq \tbinom{p}{s+m}(\frac{A}{\varepsilon})^{s+m} \lesssim (\frac{Ap}{\varepsilon})^{s+m}.
$$

Since by Assumption 6, $\pi_{1n}\to 0$, we have, w.p.a.1.,

$$
|(\mathcal{P}_n-\mathcal{P})(f(X)'\delta_{01})^2K(\frac{T-t}{h})| \leq 3h\underline{C}(\kappa')^2||\delta_{01}||_2^2/8. \tag{B.3}
$$

Similarly, since $\pi_{2n} = \sqrt{h}\pi_{1n}\to 0$, we have, w.p.a.1.,

$$
|(\mathcal{P}_n-\mathcal{P})(f(X)'\delta_{01})^2| \leq 3(\kappa')^2||\delta_{01}||_2^2/8. \tag{B.4}
$$

Combining (B.2), (B.3), and (B.4), we have, w.p.a.1.,

$$
||f(X)'\delta_{01}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}^2 \geq ||\delta_{01}||_2^2h(\kappa')^2\underline{C}/4.
$$

For the same reason, we can show that, w.p.a.1,

$$
||f(X)'\delta_l K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}^2 \leq 4||\delta_l||_2^2(\underline{C}^{-1}h(\kappa'')^2.
$$

Following (B.2), we have, w.p.a.1,

$$
\begin{aligned}
||f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} \geq & h^{1/2}||\delta_{01}||_2\kappa'\underline{C}^{1/2}/2 - h^{1/2}\sum_{l=2}^{L} 2||\delta_l||_2\kappa''\underline{C}^{-1/2} \\
\geq & h^{1/2}||\delta_{01}||_2\kappa'\underline{C}^{1/2}/2 - h^{1/2}\sum_{l=2}^{L} 2\kappa''\underline{C}^{-1/2}(||\delta_{l-1}||_1||\delta_l||_1)^{1/2}/\sqrt{m} \\
\geq & h^{1/2}||\delta_{01}||_2\kappa'\underline{C}^{1/2}/2 - 2h^{1/2}\kappa''\underline{C}^{-1/2}||\delta_{T^c}||_1/\sqrt{m} \\
\geq & h^{1/2}||\delta_{01}||_2\kappa'\underline{C}^{1/2}/2 - 2h^{1/2}\kappa''\underline{C}^{-1/2}c^{1/2}||\delta_0||_1/\sqrt{m} \\
\geq & h^{1/2}||\delta_{01}||_2\kappa'\underline{C}^{1/2}/2 - 2h^{1/2}\kappa''\underline{C}^{-1/2}c^{1/2}||\delta_0||_2\sqrt{s}/\sqrt{m} \\
\geq & h^{1/2}||\delta_0||_2\left[\kappa'\underline{C}^{1/2}/2 - 2\kappa''\underline{C}^{-1/2}c^{1/2}\sqrt{s}/\sqrt{m}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where the second inequality holds because, by construction, $||\delta_l||_2^2 \leq ||\delta_{l-1}||_1||\delta_l||_1/m$. Since $m = sl_n^{1/2}$, for n large enough, the constant inside the brackets is greater than $\kappa'\underline{C}^{1/2}/4$ which is independent of (t,u,n). Thus, we can conclude that, for n large enough,

$$
\inf_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}}\inf_{\delta\in\Delta_{2\tilde{c},t,u}}\frac{||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}}{||\delta_{T_{t,u}}||_2\sqrt{h}} \geq \kappa'\underline{C}^{1/2}/4 \equiv \underline{\kappa}.
$$

C Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof. We prove the results when $\overline{\theta}_{t,u} = \widehat{\theta}_{t,u}$. The proof for $\overline{\theta}_{t,u} = \widetilde{\theta}_{t,u}$ is exactly the same.

Note that $\phi_{t,u}(X) \equiv \mathbb{E}(Y_u|X,T=t) = \Lambda(f(X)'\theta_{t,u} + \tilde{r}_{t,u}^{\phi})$. Let $\delta_{t,u} = \hat{\theta}_{t,u} - \theta_{t,u}$, $\hat{s}_{t,u} = ||\hat{\theta}_{t,u}||_0$, and $\widehat{T}_{t,u}$ be the support of $\widehat{\theta}_{t,u}$. Then, by mean value theorem, there exists $\underline{\theta}_{t,u} \in (\theta_{t,u}, \hat{\theta}_{t,u})$ and $\overline{r}_{t,u}^{\phi} \in (0, \tilde{r}_{t,u}^{\phi})$ such that

$$
|\phi_{t,u}(X) - \widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(X)| \leq \Lambda(f(X)'\underline{\theta}_{t,u} + \overline{r}_{t,u}^{\phi})(1 - \Lambda(f(X)'\underline{\theta}_{t,u} + \overline{r}_{t,u}^{\phi}))(f(X)'\delta_{t,u} + \tilde{r}_{t,u}^{\phi}).
$$

By the proof of Lemma K.1, we have, w.p.a.1,

$$
|\tilde{r}_{t,u}^{\phi}| \leq [\underline{C}/2(1-\underline{C}/2)]^{-1}|r_{t,u}^{\phi}|.
$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} |f(X)'\underline{\theta}_{t,u} + \overline{r}^{\phi}_{t,u} - f(X)'\theta_{t,u} - r^{\phi}_{t,u}| \\
\lesssim &\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} |f(X)'\delta_{t,u}| + \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} |r^{\phi}_{t,u}| \\
\lesssim &K_n \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||\delta_{t,u}||_1 + O((\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh))^{-1/2}) = o_p(1)
\end{aligned} \tag{C.1}$$

where the last equality is because, by Lemma K.1, $\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||\delta_{t,u}||_1 = O_p((\log(p)s^2)^{1/2}(nh)^{-1/2})$ and $\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh) \to 0$. In addition,

$$\Lambda(f(X)'\theta_{t,u} + \tilde{r}^{\phi}_{t,u}) = \mathbb{E}(Y_u|X, T = t) \in [\overline{C}, 1 - \overline{C}].$$

Hence, there exists some positive constant c and c' only depending on $\underline{C}$ such that, w.p.a.1,

$$\Lambda(f(X)'\underline{\theta}_{t,u} + \overline{r}^{\phi}_{t,u})(1 - \Lambda(f(X)'\underline{\theta}_{t,u} + \overline{r}^{\phi}_{t,u})) \leq c$$

and uniformly over $(t, u) \in \mathcal{TU}$,

$$|\phi_{t,u}(X) - \widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(X)| \leq c(f(X)'\delta_{t,u} + \tilde{r}^{\phi}_{t,u})) \leq c'(f(X)'\delta_{t,u} + r^{\phi}_{t,u})). \tag{C.2}$$

By Assumption 3 and Lemma K.1, w.p.a.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||(\phi_{t,u}(X) - \widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(X))K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} \\
\leq &\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} c\left[||f(X)'\delta_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} + ||r^{\phi}_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}\right] \\
= &O_p((\log(p)s/n)^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

This is the first result in Theorem 3.1.

Next, following (C.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||\phi_{t,u}(X) - \widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(X)||_{P,\infty} \lesssim &K_n \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||\delta_{t,u}||_1 + O((\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh))^{1/2}) \\
= &O_p((\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh))^{1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

This is the second result in Theorem 3.1.

Last, recall that $\lambda = l_n(\log(p)nh)^{1/2}$. by FOC, for any $j \in \widehat{T}_{t,u}$, we have

$$\left|\mathcal{P}_n\left[(Y_u - \Lambda(f(X)'\hat{\theta}_{t,u}))f_j(X)K(\frac{T-t}{h})\right]\right| = \widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,jj}\frac{\lambda}{n}.$$

Denote $\xi_{t,u} = Y_u - \phi_{t,u}(X)$. By Lemma K.1, K.2 and K.5, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, with probability greater than $1-\varepsilon$, there exists positive constants C_λ and C, which only depends on ε and is independent of (t,u,n), such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\lambda\hat{s}_{t,u}^{1/2}}{n} =& \left|\left|\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u}^{-1}\left\{\mathcal{P}_n\left[(Y_u - \Lambda(f(X)\hat{\theta}_{t,u}))f(X)K(\frac{T-t}{h})\right]\right\}_{\widehat{T}_{t,u}}\right|\right|_2 \\
\leq& \sup_{||\theta||_0\leq\hat{s}_{t,u},||\theta||_2=1}||\theta||_1 \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}}||\Psi_{t,u,0}^{-1}(\mathcal{P}_n\xi_{t,u}f(X)K(\frac{T-t}{h}))||_\infty \\
&+ \frac{||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty}{l}\sup_{||\theta||_0\leq\hat{s}_{t,u},||\theta||_2=1}\left|\left\{\mathcal{P}_n\left(\Lambda(f(X)'\hat{\theta}_{t,u}) - \Lambda(f(X)'\theta_{t,u}) - r_{t,u}^{\phi}\right)f(X)'\theta K(\frac{T-t}{h})\right\}\right| \\
\leq& \frac{C_\lambda\lambda\hat{s}_{t,u}^{1/2}}{nl_n} + \frac{c'||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty}{l}||(f(X)'\delta_{t,u} + r_{t,u}^{\phi})K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} \\
&\times \sup_{||\theta||_0\leq\hat{s}_{t,u},||\theta||_2=1}||f(X)'\theta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} \\
\leq& \frac{\lambda\hat{s}_{t,u}^{1/2}}{2n} + C(\log(p)s/n)^{1/2}\phi_{max}^{1/2}(\hat{s}_{t,u})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_{max}(s) = \sup_{||\theta||_0\leq s,||\theta||_2=1}||f(X)'\theta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}$. This implies that there exists a constant C only depending on ε, such that, with probability greater than $1-\varepsilon$,

$$\hat{s}_{t,u} \leq Cs\phi_{max}(\hat{s}_{t,u})/h.$$

Let $\mathcal{M} = \{m \in \mathbb{Z} : m > 2Cs\phi_{max}(m)/h\}$. We can show that for any $m \in \mathcal{M}$, $\hat{s}_{t,u} \leq m$. In addition, by Lemma K.4, we can choose $C_s > 2C\underline{C}^{-1/2}\kappa''$, which is independent of (t,u,n), such that

$$2Cs\phi_{max}(C_s s)/h \leq 2C\underline{C}^{-1/2}\kappa'' s < C_s s.$$

This implies $C_s s \in \mathcal{M}$ and thus with probability greater than $1-\varepsilon$, $\hat{s}_{t,u} \leq C_s s$. This result hold for all $(t,u) \in \mathcal{TU}$.

□

D Proof of Theorem 3.2

Let $\xi_t(X) = \frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - f_t(X)$ and recall that $\lambda = l_n(\log(p)nh)^{1/2}$, for some C_λ large enough, such that $C_\lambda^{-1} < l < 1 < L$. In addition, denote

$$E_1 = \{||r_t^f(X)||_{P_n,2} \leq C_r(\log(p)s/(nh))^{1/2}\},$$

$$E_2 = \{\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} C_\lambda||\mathcal{P}_n\widehat{\Psi}_{t0}^{-1}\xi_t(X)f(X)||_\infty \leq \frac{\lambda}{nh}\},$$

and

$$E_3 = \{l\widehat{\Psi}_{t0} \leq \widehat{\Psi}_t \leq L\widehat{\Psi}_{t0} \quad \text{and} \quad C_f/2 \leq \inf_{t\in\mathcal{T}}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,0}||_\infty \leq \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,0}||_\infty \leq 2/C_f\}$$

where C_r and C_f are some positive constants which will be defined later in this proof and in Lemma K.7, respectively. $\widehat{\Psi}_{t,0} = \text{Diag}(l_{t,0,1}, \cdots, l_{t,0,p})$ with

$$l_{t,0,j} = \left[\mathcal{P}_n h\left(\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - f_t(X)\right)^2 f_j^2(X)\right]^{1/2}$$

is the ideal weight.

By Assumption 3, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant C_r (possibly depends on ε) such that E_1 holds with probability greater than $1-\varepsilon$. Lemma K.6 shows that, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant C_λ (possibly depends on ε), such that $C_\lambda^{-1} < l$ and E_2 holds with probability greater than $1-\varepsilon$. By Lemma K.7, there exists $l < 1 < L$ independent of n, t such that E_3 holds uniformly over $t \in \mathcal{T}$ with probability greater than $1-\varepsilon_n$ for some $\varepsilon_n \to 0$. Under E_1, E_2, and E_3, which occur with probability greater than $1-2\varepsilon-\varepsilon_n$, Lemma J.3 and J.4 in Belloni et al. (2017) imply that

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}}||\hat{f}_t(X) - f_t(X)||_{P_n,2} = O_p(l_n(\log(p)s/(nh))^{1/2}),$$

$$\hat{s} = \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}}||\hat{\beta}_t||_0 = O_p(s),$$

and

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}}||\hat{\beta}_t - \beta_t||_1 = O_p(l_n(\log(p)s^2/(nh))^{1/2}).$$

Then, we have

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\hat{f}_t(X) - f_t(X)||_{P,\infty} = O_p(l_n(\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh))^{1/2}).$$

In addition, by Lemma J.5 in Belloni et al. (2017),

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\tilde{f}_t(X) - f_t(X)||_{P_n,2} = O_p(l_n(\log(p)s/(nh))^{1/2}),$$

and

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\tilde{f}_t(X) - f_t(X)||_{P,\infty} = O(l_n(\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh))^{1/2}).$$

E Proof of Theorem 3.3

Let $\hat{\alpha}^* = \mathcal{P}_n\eta\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \widehat{\phi}_{t,u}, \hat{f}_t)$ where either $\eta = 1$ or η is a random variable that satisfies Assumption 8. When $\eta = 1$, $\hat{\alpha}^*(t,u) = \hat{\alpha}(t,u)$, which is our original estimator. When η satisfies Assumption 8, $\hat{\alpha}^*(t,u)$ is the bootstrap estimator. In the following, we establish the linear expansion of both the original and bootstrap estimators in one shoot.

Let $\varepsilon_n = l_n(\log(p)s/(nh))^{1/2}$ and $\delta_n = l_n(\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh))^{1/2}$. For some $M > 0$, which will be specified later, denote

$$\mathcal{G}_t = \left\{ f(X)'\beta : \begin{array}{c} ||\beta||_0 \leq Ms, \quad ||f(X)'\beta - f_t(X)||_{P,\infty} \leq M\delta_n, \\ ||f(X)'\beta - f_t(X)||_{P_n,2} \leq M\varepsilon_n \end{array} \right\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{H}_{t,u} = \left\{ \Lambda(f(x)'\theta) : \begin{array}{c} ||\theta||_0 \leq Ms, ||(\Lambda(f(X)'\theta) - \phi_{t,u}(X))K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} \leq M\varepsilon_n h^{1/2}, \\ ||\Lambda(f(X)'\theta) - \phi_{t,u}(X)||_{P,\infty} \leq M\delta_n. \end{array} \right\}$$

By Theorem 3.1 and 3.2, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant M such that, with probability greater than $1-\varepsilon$, $\hat{f}_t(\cdot) \in \mathcal{G}_t$ uniformly in $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{H}_{t,u}$ uniformly in $(t,u) \in \mathcal{TU}$.

We focus on the case in which $(\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}, \hat{f}_t) \in (\mathcal{G}_t \times \mathcal{H}_{t,u})$. Let $(\overline{\phi}, \overline{f}) = (\widehat{\phi}_{t,u}, \hat{f}_t)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\alpha}^*(t,u) - \alpha(t,u) =&(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})\eta\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \phi_{t,u}, f_t) + (\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})\Big[\eta\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \overline{\phi}, \overline{f}) - \eta\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \phi_{t,u}, f_t)\Big] \\ &+\mathcal{P}\Big[\eta\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \overline{\phi}, \overline{f}) - \eta\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \phi_{t,u}, f_t)\Big] + \Big[\mathcal{P}\eta\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \phi_{t,u}, f_t) - \alpha(t,u)\Big] \\ =&I + II + III + IV.\end{aligned}$$

Term IV is $O(h^2)$ uniformly in $(t,u) \in \mathcal{TU}$. For term III, uniformly over $(t,u) \in \mathcal{TU}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{P}\eta\Big[\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \overline{\phi}, \overline{f}) - \Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \phi_{t,u}, f_t)\Big] \\ =&\mathbb{E}\bigg(\overline{\phi}(X) - \phi(X)\bigg)\bigg(1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}(K(\frac{T-t}{h})|X)}{hf_t(X)}\bigg) + \mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{Y_u - \overline{\phi}(X)}{\overline{f}_t(X)f_t(X)}\bigg)\bigg(\frac{f_t(X) - \overline{f}_t(X)}{h}\bigg)K(\frac{T-t}{h}) \\ =&O(\delta_n h^2) + \mathbb{E}\bigg(\frac{Y_u - \phi_{t,u}(X)}{\overline{f}_t(X)f_t(X)}\bigg)\bigg(\frac{f_t(X) - \overline{f}_t(X)}{h}\bigg)K(\frac{T-t}{h}) \\ =&O(\delta_n h^2) + O(h^{-1}||(\phi_{t,u}(X) - \overline{\phi}(X))K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P,2}||(f_t(X) - \overline{f}_t(X))K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P,2}) \\ =&O(\varepsilon_n^2).\end{aligned} \tag{E.1}$$

The second equality of (E.1) is because that there exists a constant c independent of n such that

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}}\bigg|1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}(K(\frac{T-t}{h})|X)}{hf_t(X)}\bigg| \leq ch^2$$

and then

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\bigg(\overline{\phi}(X) - \phi(X)\bigg)\bigg(1 - \frac{\mathbb{E}(K(\frac{T-t}{h})|X)}{hf_t(X)}\bigg) \\ \leq&ch^{3/2}||(\overline{\phi}(X) - \phi(X))K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P,2} \\ =&ch^{3/2}[\mathbb{E}||(\overline{\phi}(X) - \phi(X))K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||^2_{P_n,2}]^{1/2} = O(\varepsilon_n h^2).\end{aligned}$$

The third equality of (E.1) is by the fact that $||\overline{f}_t(X) - f_t(X)||_{P,\infty} = o(1)$, $f_t(x)$ is assumed to be bounded away from zero uniformly over t, τ, and the Cauchy inequality. The fourth inequality of (E.1) is because

$$||(\phi_{t,u}(X) - \overline{\phi}(X))K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P,2} = [\mathbb{E}||(\phi_{t,u}(X) - \overline{\phi}(X))K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||^2_{P_n,2}]^{1/2} = O(\varepsilon_n h^{1/2})$$

and for some constant $c > 0$ independent of (t, u, n),

$$||(f_t(X) - \overline{f}_t(X))K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P,2}) \leq c[h\mathbb{E}||f_t(X) - \overline{f}_t(X)||^2_{P_n,2}]^{1/2} = O(\varepsilon_n h^{1/2}).$$

The last equality of (E.1) is because $\delta_n h^2/\varepsilon_n^2 \to 0$.

For the term II, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})\eta\left[\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \overline{\phi}, \overline{f}) - \Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \phi_{t,u}, f_t)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}||\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P}||_{\mathcal{F}}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F} = \cup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}}\mathcal{F}_{t,u} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_{t,u} = \left\{\eta\left[\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \overline{\phi}, \overline{f}_t) - \Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \phi_{t,u}, f_t)\right] : \overline{\phi} \in \mathcal{H}_{t,u}, \overline{f}_t \in \mathcal{G}_t\right\}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{F}$ has envelope $|\frac{\eta}{h}|$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^2 \equiv & \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}f^2 \\
\lesssim & \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} \mathbb{E}\left[(\overline{\phi}(X) - \phi(X))^2\left(1 - \frac{K(\frac{T-t}{h})}{f_t(X)h}\right)^2\right] \\
& + \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{Y_u - \overline{\phi}(X)}{\overline{f}_t(X)f_t(X)h}K(\frac{T-t}{h})\left(f_t(X) - \overline{f}_t(X)\right)\right]^2 \\
\lesssim & \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} \mathbb{E}\left[(\overline{\phi}(X) - \phi(X))^2\right]h^{-1} + h^{-1}\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} \mathbb{E}\left[f_t(X) - \overline{f}_t(X)\right]^2 \lesssim h^{-1}\varepsilon_n^2,
\end{aligned}$$

and since $\mathcal{F}$ is nested by

$$\overline{F} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \Lambda(f(X)'\theta), f(X)'\beta) - \Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \phi_{t,u}, f_t) : (t,u) \in \mathcal{TU}, \\ ||\theta||_0 \leq Ms, ||\beta||_0 \leq Ms \end{array} \right\},$$

where

$$\sup_Q \log N(\mathcal{F}, e_Q, \varepsilon||F||_{Q,2}) \lesssim s\log(p) + s\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}) \vee 0.$$

In addition, we note that $||\max_{1\leq i\leq n}|\eta_i/h|||_{p,2} \lesssim \log(n)h^{-1}$. When $\eta = 1$, the above result holds trivially. When η satisfies Assumption 8, then η has sub-exponential tail, and the result holds by Lemma 2.2.2 in Van der Vaart and Wellner (1996). Therefore, by Corollary

5.1 of Chernozhukov et al. (2014), we have

$$\mathbb{E}||\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P}||_{\mathcal{F}} \lesssim \varepsilon_n (nh)^{-1/2} s^{1/2} \log^{1/2}(p) + (nh)^{-1} s \log(p) = \varepsilon_n^2.$$

This implies that $\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} II = O_p(\varepsilon_n^2)$. Combining the bounds for II, III, and IV, we have

$$\hat{\alpha}^*(t,u) - \alpha(t,u) = (\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})\eta\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \phi_{t,u}, f_t) + R_n(t,u) \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} |R_n(t,u)| = O_p(\varepsilon_n^2 + h^2).$$

Then, Assumption 7 implies the desired results.

F Proof of Theorem 3.4

We first derive the linear expansion of the rearrangement of $\hat{\alpha}^*(t,u)$ as defined in the proof of Theorem 3.3. Let $Q(t,v) = \alpha(t, \psi^{\leftarrow}(v))$ for $v \in [0,1]$,

$$F(t,y) = \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{Q(t,v) \le y\} dv, \quad \text{and} \quad F(t,y|h_n) = \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{Q(t,v) + s_n h_n \le y\} dv,$$

where $s_n = (nh)^{-1/2}$ and $h_n(t,v) = (nh)^{1/2}(\hat{\alpha}^*(t,\psi^{\leftarrow}(v)) - \alpha(t,\psi^{\leftarrow}(v)))$. Lemma K.8 verifies Assumption 9 with $(\delta_n, \varepsilon_n) = (1, (nh)^{-1/2}\log(n))$ and $(\delta_n, \varepsilon_n) = (h^{1/2}, (nh)^{-1/2}\log(n))$ under Assumption 7.1 and 7.2, respectively.

In addition, since $\alpha(t,u) = P(Y_t \le u)$, v^y in Assumption 9 is $\psi(q_y(t))$ where $q_y(t)$ is the y-th quantile of Y_t, and $\partial_v \alpha(t, \psi^{\leftarrow}(v)) = f_{Y_t}(\psi^{\leftarrow}(v))\partial_v \psi^{\leftarrow}(v)$. Then, by Lemma I.1,

$$\frac{F(t,y|h_n) - F(t,y)}{s_n} + \frac{h_n(t, \psi(q_y(t)))\psi'(q_y(t))}{f_{Y_t}(q_y(t))} = o_p(\delta_n) \tag{F.1}$$

uniformly over $(t,y) \in \{(t,y) : y = \alpha(t,\psi^{\leftarrow}(v)), (t,v) \in \mathcal{T} \times [0,1]\}$.

Let $\hat{\alpha}^{*r}(t,u) = F^{\leftarrow}(t, \psi(u)|h_n)$ and $J_n(t,y) = \frac{F(t,y|h_n) - F(t,y)}{s_n}$. Furthermore, notice that $\alpha^{*r}(t,u) = \alpha(t,u) = F^{\leftarrow}(t,\psi(u))$, $F^{\leftarrow}(t,v) = \alpha(t,\psi^{\leftarrow}(v))$,

$$F(t,y) = \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{Q(t,v) \le y\} dv = \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{v \le \psi(q_y(t))\} dv = \psi(q_y(t)),$$

and

$$\partial_y F(t,y) = \psi'(q_y(t))/f_{Y_t}(q_y(t)).$$

Lemma K.8 verifies Assumption 10 with

$$(\delta_n, \varepsilon_n) = (1, (nh)^{-1/2}\log(n)) \quad \text{and} \quad (\delta_n, \varepsilon_n) = (h^{1/2}, (nh)^{-1/2}\log(n))$$

under Assumption 7.1 and 7.2, respectively. Then, by Lemma I.2 with $F^{\leftarrow}(t,v) = \alpha(t, \psi^{\leftarrow}(v))$ and $u = \psi^{\leftarrow}(v)$,

$$\frac{\hat{\alpha}^{*r}(t,u) - \alpha(t,u)}{s_n} + \frac{F(t, \alpha(t,u)|h_n) - F(t, \alpha(t,u)) f_{Y_t}(u)}{s_n \psi'(u)} = o_p(\delta_n). \tag{F.2}$$

Combining (F.1) and (F.2), we have

$$(nh)^{1/2}(\hat{\alpha}^{*r}(t,u) - \alpha(t,u)) = h_n(t, \psi(u)) + o_p(\delta_n) = (nh)^{1/2}(\hat{\alpha}^{*}(t,u) - \alpha(t,u)) + o_p(\delta_n) \tag{F.3}$$

uniformly over $(t,u) \in \mathcal{TU}$.

We can apply Lemma I.2 on $\hat{\alpha}^{*r}(t,u)$ again with $J_n(t,u) = (nh)^{1/2}(\hat{\alpha}^{*r}(t,u) - \alpha(t,u))$, $F(t,u) = P(Y_t \leq u) = \alpha(t,u)$, $f(t,u) = f_{Y_t}(u)$, and $F^{\leftarrow}(t,\tau) = q_\tau(t)$. Lemma K.8 verifies Assumption 10 with $(\delta_n, \varepsilon_n) = (1, (nh)^{-1/2}\log(n))$ and $(\delta_n, \varepsilon_n) = (h^{1/2}, (nh)^{-1/2}\log(n))$ under Assumption 7.1 and 7.2, respectively. Then, by Lemma I.2,

$$\frac{\hat{q}^*_\tau(t) - q_\tau(t)}{s_n} = -\frac{J_n(t, q_\tau(t))}{f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t))} + o_p(\delta_n) = -\frac{(nh)^{1/2}(\hat{\alpha}^{*r}(t, q_\tau(t)) - \tau)}{f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t))} + o_p(\delta_n) \tag{F.4}$$

uniformly over $(t,\tau) \in \mathcal{TI}$.

Combining (F.3), (F.4), and Theorem 3.3, we have

$$\hat{q}^*_\tau(t) - q_\tau(t) = -(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})\eta \Pi_{t,u}(W_{q_\tau(t)}, \phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}, f_t)/f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t)) + R_n(t,\tau) + o_p(\delta_n(nh)^{-1/2}).$$

By taking $\delta_n = 1$ and $\delta_n = h^{1/2}$ under Assumption 7.1 and 7.2, respectively, we can establish the desired results.

G Proof of Theorem 3.5

We consider the general case in which the observations are weighted by $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as above. For brevity, denote $\hat{\delta} \equiv (\hat{\delta}_0, \hat{\delta}_1)' = (\hat{\beta}^{*0}_\tau(t), \hat{\beta}^{*1}_\tau(t))'$ and $\delta \equiv (\delta_0, \delta_1)' = (\beta^0_\tau(t), \beta^1_\tau(t))$. Then,

$$\hat{\delta} = \widehat{\Sigma}_2^{-1}\widehat{\Sigma}_1,$$

in which

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})\eta_i \hat{q}^*_\tau(T_i) \\ \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})(T_i-t)\eta_i \hat{q}^*_\tau(T_i) \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})\eta_i & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})(T_i-t)\eta_i \\ \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})(T_i-t)\eta_i & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})(T_i-t)^2\eta_i. \end{pmatrix}$$

Let $\Sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} f(t) & 0 \\ \kappa_2 f^{(1)}(t) & \kappa_2 f(t) \end{pmatrix}$ and $G = \begin{pmatrix} h^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & h^{-3} \end{pmatrix}$. Then we have

$$G\hat{\Sigma}_2 - \Sigma_2 = O^*_p(\log^{1/2}(n)(nh^3)^{-1/2}).$$

In addition, note that

$$\hat{q}^*_\tau(T_i) = \delta_0 + \delta_1(T_i - t) + (q_\tau(T_i) - \delta_0 - \delta_1(T_i - t)) + (\hat{q}^*_\tau(T_i) - q_\tau(T_i))$$

and

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{nh}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})\eta_i \Big(q_\tau(T_i) - \delta_0 - \delta_1(T_i - t)\Big) \\ \frac{1}{nh^3}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})(T_i-t)\eta_i \Big(q_\tau(T_i) - \delta_0 - \delta_1(T_i - t)\Big) \end{pmatrix} = O^*_p(\sqrt{\frac{\log(n)h}{n}} + h^2) = o^*_p(n^{-1/2})$$

Therefore,

$$G\widehat{\Sigma}_1 = G\widehat{\Sigma}_2\delta + \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{nh}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})\Big(\hat{q}_\tau(T_i) - q_\tau(T_i)\Big)\eta_i \\ \frac{1}{nh^3}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})(T_i-t)\Big(\hat{q}_\tau(T_i) - q_\tau(T_i)\Big)\eta_i \end{pmatrix} + o^*_p(n^{-1/2}). \tag{G.1}$$

By Theorem 3.4,

$$\mathbb{E}\frac{Y_u - \phi_{t,u}(X)}{f_t(X)h}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) = O^*(h^2), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}\phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X) = \tau,$$

we have

$$\hat{q}^*_\tau(t) - q_\tau(t) = \frac{-1}{f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t))}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{Y_{q_\tau(t),j} - \phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j)}{f_t(X_j)h}K(\frac{T_j-t}{h}) + \phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j) - \tau\right) + o^*_p(n^{-1/2}), \tag{G.2}$$

where $o_p^*(n^{-1/2})$ term is uniform over $(t,\tau) \in \mathcal{TI}$. Let $\Upsilon_i = (Y_i, T_i, X_i, \eta_i)$. Then, by plugging (G.2) in (G.1) and noticing that

$$\begin{Bmatrix} \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} \frac{1}{nh}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})\eta_i \\ \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} \frac{1}{nh^3}\sum_{i=1}^n K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})|T_i-t|\eta_i \end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} O_p(1) \\ O_p(h^{-1}) \end{Bmatrix},$$

we have

$$G\widehat{\Sigma}_1 = G\widehat{\Sigma}_2\delta + \frac{1}{n(n-1)}\sum_{i\neq j}\eta_i\eta_j\Gamma(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau) + \begin{Bmatrix} o_p^*(n^{-1/2}) \\ o_p^*(n^{-1/2}h^{-1}) \end{Bmatrix}$$

where $\Gamma(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau) = (\Gamma_0(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau), \Gamma_1(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau))'$,

$$\Gamma_0(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau) = \frac{1}{hf_{Y_{T_i}}(q_\tau(T_i))}K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})\left(\frac{Y_{q_\tau(T_i),j} - \phi_{T_i,q_\tau(T_i)}(X_j)}{f_{T_i}(X_j)h}K(\frac{T_j-T_i}{h}) + \phi_{T_i,q_\tau(T_i)}(X_j) - \tau\right),$$

and

$$\Gamma_1(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau) = \frac{(T_i-t)}{h^3f_{Y_{T_i}}(q_\tau(T_i))}K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})\left(\frac{Y_{q_\tau(T_i),j} - \phi_{T_i,q_\tau(T_i)}(X_j)}{f_{T_i}(X_j)h}K(\frac{T_j-T_i}{h}) + \phi_{T_i,q_\tau(T_i)}(X_j) - \tau\right).$$

Let $\Gamma^s(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau) = (\Gamma(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau) + \Gamma(\Upsilon_j,\Upsilon_i;t,\tau))/2$. Then we have

$$\hat{\beta}_\tau^{1*}(t) - \beta_\tau^1(t) = e_2'(G\widehat{\Sigma}_2)^{-1}U_n(t,\tau) + o_p^*(n^{-1/2}h^{-1}), \tag{G.3}$$

where $e_2 = (0,1)'$ and $U_n(t,\tau) = (C_n^2)^{-1}\sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\eta_i\eta_j\Gamma^s(\cdot,\cdot;t,\tau)$ is a U-process indexed by (t,τ). By Lemma K.9,

$$e_2'(G\widehat{\Sigma}_2)^{-1}U_n(t,\tau) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\eta_j(\kappa_2 f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t))f_t(X_j)h^2)^{-1}\left[Y_{q_\tau(t),j} - \phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j)\right]\overline{K}(\frac{T_j-t}{h}) + o_p^*((nh^3)^{-1/2}). \tag{G.4}$$

Combining (G.3) and (G.4), we have

$$\hat{\beta}_\tau^{1*}(t) - \beta_\tau^1(t) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\eta_j(\kappa_2 f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t))f_t(X_j)h^2)^{-1}\left[Y_{q_\tau(t),j} - \phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j)\right]\overline{K}(\frac{T_j-t}{h}) + o_p^*((nh^3)^{-1/2}).$$

H Proof of Theorem 4.1

By the proof of Theorem 3.4 and 3.5, we have

$$\hat{q}^b_\tau(t) - \hat{q}_\tau(t) = -(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})(\eta - 1)\Pi_{t,u}(W_{q_\tau(t)}, \phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}, f_t)/f_t(q_\tau(t)) + o_p((nh)^{-1/2})$$

and

$$\hat{\beta}^{1b}_\tau(t) - \hat{\beta}^1_\tau(t) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(\eta_j - 1)(\kappa_2 f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t)) f_t(X_j) h^2)^{-1}\left[Y_{q_\tau(t),j} - \phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j)\right]\overline{K}(\frac{T_j - t}{h}) + o^*_p((nh^3)^{-1/2}).$$

Then, it is straightforward to show that $\sqrt{nh}(\hat{q}^b_\tau(t) - \hat{q}_\tau(t))$ and $(nh^3)^{1/2}(\hat{\beta}^{1b}_\tau(t) - \hat{\beta}^1_\tau(t))$ weakly converge to the limiting distribution of $\sqrt{nh}(\hat{q}_\tau(t) - q_\tau(t))$ and $(nh^3)^{1/2}(\hat{\beta}^1_\tau(t) - \beta^1_\tau(t))$, respectively, conditional on data in the sense of Van der Vaart and Wellner (1996, Section 2.9). The desired results then follow.

I Lemmas for Theorem 3.4

Let $Q(t, v)$ be a generic monotonic function with $v \in [0, 1]$. The functional ψ maps $Q(t, v)$ to $F(t, y)$ as follows:

$$\Psi(Q)(t, y) \equiv F(t, y) = \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{Q(t, v) \leq y\} dv.$$

We want to derive a linear expansion of $\Psi(Q + s_n h_n) - \Psi(Q)$ where $s_n \downarrow 0$ as the sample size $n \to \infty$ and $h_n(t, v)$ is some perturbation function.

Assumption 9.

1. *$Q(t, v)$ is twice differentiable w.r.t. v with both derivatives bounded. In addition, $\partial_v Q(t, v) > c$ for some positive constant c, uniformly over $(t, v) \in \mathcal{T} \times [0, 1]$.*

2. *There exist two vanishing sequences ε_n and ε_n such that*

$$\sup_{(t,v,v') \in \mathcal{T} \times [0,1]^2, |v - v'| \leq \varepsilon_n} |h_n(t, v) - h_n(t, v')| = o(\delta_n),$$

$$\sup_{(t,v) \in \mathcal{T} \times [0,1]} |h_n(t, v)| s_n = o(\varepsilon_n), \quad \textit{and} \quad \sup_{(t,v) \in \mathcal{T} \times [0,1]} |h_n(t, v)|^2 s_n = o(\delta_n).$$

Lemma I.1. *Let* $(t,y) \in \mathcal{TY} \equiv \{(t,y) : y = Q(t,v), (t,v) \in \mathcal{T} \times [0,1]\}$, $F(t,y|h_n) = \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{Q(t,v) + s_n h_n(t,v) \leq y\}dv$, *and* $y = Q(t,v^y)$. *If Assumption 9 holds, then*

$$\frac{F(t,y|h_n) - F(t,y)}{s_n} - \left(\frac{-h_n(t,v^y)}{\partial_v Q(t,v^y)}\right) = o(\delta_n)$$

uniformly over $(t,y) \in \mathcal{TY}$.

Proof. Consider $(t_n, y_n) \to (t_0, y_0)$ and denote v_n as $y_n = Q(t_n, v_n)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} F(t_n,y_n|h_n) &= \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{Q(t_n,v) + s_n h_n(t_n,v) \leq y_n\}dv \\ &= \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{Q(t_n,v) + s_n(h_n(t_n,v_n) + h_n(t_n,v) - h_n(t_n,v_n)) \leq y_n\}dv. \end{aligned}$$

For fixed n, if $v \in \mathbb{B}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n) \cap [0,1]$, by Assumption 9,

$$h_n(t_n,v) - h_n(t_n,v_n) = o(\delta_n).$$

Therefore, for any $\delta > 0$, there exists a n_1 such that if $n \geq n_1$, $|h_n(t_n,v) - h_n(t_n,v_n)| \leq \delta\delta_n$ and

$$F(t_n,y_n|h_n) \leq \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{Q(t_n,v) + s_n(h_n(t_n,v_n) - \delta\delta_n) \leq y_n\}dv.$$

If $v \notin \mathbb{B}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n)$, then there exists n_2 such that for $n \geq n_2$,

$$|Q(t_n,v) - y_n| \geq c\varepsilon_n. \tag{I.1}$$

Furthermore, by Assumption 9,

$$s_n h_n(t_n,v) \leq \sup_{(t,v)\in\mathcal{T}\times[0,1]} |h_n(t,v)| s_n = o(\varepsilon_n).$$

Therefore,

$$F(t_n,y_n|h_n) = \int_0^1 \mathbb{1}\{Q(t_n,v) \leq y_n\}dv.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{F(t_n, y_n|h_n) - F(t_n, y_n)}{s_n} - \left(\frac{-h_n(t_n, v_n)}{\partial_v Q(t_n, v_n)}\right) \\
&\leq \int_{\mathbb{B}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n)} \Big(\mathbb{1}\{Q(t_n, v) + s_n(h_n(t_n, v_n) - \delta\delta_n) \leq y_n\} - \mathbb{1}\{Q(t_n, v) \leq y_n\} \Big) dv + \left(\frac{h_n(t_n, v_n)}{\partial_v Q(t_n, v_n)}\right) \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{J}_n \cap [y_n, y_n - s_n(h_n(t_n, v_n) - \delta\delta_n)]} \frac{dy}{s_n \partial_v Q(t_n, v_n(y))} + \frac{h_n(t_n, v_n)}{\partial_v Q(t_n, v_n)},
\end{aligned} \tag{I.2}$$

where the second line is by the change of variable $y = Q(t_n, v)$, $v_n(y) = Q^{\leftarrow}(t_n, \cdot)(y)$, and $\mathbb{J}_n$ is the image of $\mathbb{B}_{\varepsilon_n}(v_n)$. By (I.1) again, we know that $[y_n, y_n - s_n(h_n(t_n, v_n) - \delta\delta_n)]$ is nested by $\mathbb{J}_n$ for n sufficiently large. In addition, since $\partial_v Q(t, v) > c$ uniformly over $\mathcal{T} \times [0, 1]$, for $y \in [y_n, y_n - s_n(h_n(t_n, v_n) - \delta\delta_n)]$,

$$|v_n(y) - v_n| = |Q^{\leftarrow}(t_n, \cdot)(y) - Q^{\leftarrow}(t_n, \cdot)(y_n)| \leq C s_n \Big(\sup_{(t,v) \in \mathcal{T} \times [0,1]} |h_n(t, v)| + \delta\delta_n \Big).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{the RHS of (I.2)} = &\int_{[y_n, y_n - s_n(h_n(t_n, v_n) - \delta\delta_n)]} \frac{dy}{s_n \partial_v Q(t_n, v_n(y))} + \frac{h_n(t_n, v_n)}{\partial_v Q(t_n, v_n)} \\
\leq &\frac{\delta\delta_n}{\partial_v Q(t_n, v_n)} + \int_{[y_n, y_n - s_n(h_n(t_n, v_n) - \delta\delta_n)]} \left(\frac{1}{\partial_v Q(t_n, v_n(y))} - \frac{1}{\partial_v Q(t_n, v_n)}\right) \frac{dy}{s_n} \\
\leq &C\delta\delta_n + C s_n \Big(\sup_{(t,v) \in \mathcal{T} \times [0,1]} |h_n^2(t, v)| + \delta^2 \delta_n^2 \Big) \leq C' \delta\delta_n.
\end{aligned}$$

Since δ is arbitrary, by letting $\delta \to 0$, we obtain that

$$\frac{F(t_n, y_n|h_n) - F(t_n, y_n)}{s_n} - \left(\frac{-h_n(t_n, v_n)}{\partial_v Q(t_n, v_n)}\right) \leq o(\delta_n).$$

Similarly, we can show that

$$\frac{F(t_n, y_n|h_n) - F(t_n, y_n)}{s_n} - \left(\frac{-h_n(t_n, v_n)}{\partial_v Q(t_n, v_n)}\right) \geq o(\delta_n).$$

Therefore, we have proved that

$$\frac{F(t_n, y_n|h_n) - F(t_n, y_n)}{s_n} - \left(\frac{-h_n(t_n, v_n)}{\partial_v Q(t_n, v_n)}\right) = o(\delta_n).$$

Since the above result holds for any sequence of (t_n, y_n), we have established that, uniformly over $(t, y) \in \mathcal{TY}$,

$$\frac{F(t, y|h_n) - F(t, y)}{s_n} - \left(\frac{-h_n(t, v^y)}{\partial_v Q(t, v^y)}\right) = o(\delta_n).$$

□

Let $F(t, y)$ and $F^{\leftarrow}(t, u)$ be a monotonic function and its inverse w.r.t. y, respectively. Next, we consider the linear expansion of the inverse functional:

$$(F + s_n J_n)^{\leftarrow} - F^{\leftarrow}$$

where $s_n \downarrow 0$ as the sample size $n \to \infty$ and $J_n(t, y)$ is some perturbation function.

Assumption 10.

1. *$F(t, y)$ has a compact support $\mathcal{TY} = \{(t, y) : y = Q(t, v), (t, v) \in \mathcal{TV} \equiv \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{V}\}$. Denote $\mathcal{V}_\varepsilon$, $\mathcal{TY}_\varepsilon$, $\mathcal{Y}_{t\varepsilon}$, and $\underline{y}_t$ as a compact subset of $\mathcal{V}$, $\{(t, y) : y = Q(t, v), (t, v) \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{V}_\varepsilon\}$, the projection of $\mathcal{TY}_\varepsilon$ on $T = t$, and the lower bound of $\overline{(\mathcal{Y}_{\varepsilon t})^\varepsilon}$, respectively. Then for any $t \in \mathcal{T}$, $\underline{y}_t > -\infty$ and $\overline{(\mathcal{Y}_{\varepsilon t})^\varepsilon} \subset \mathcal{Y}_t$.*

2. *$F(t, y)$ is monotonic and two-times differentiable w.r.t. y. The first and second derivatives are denoted as $f(t, y)$ and $f'(t, y)$ respectively. Then both $f(t, y)$ and $f'(t, y)$ are bounded and $f(t, y)$ is also bounded away from zero, uniformly over $\mathcal{TY}$.*

3. *Let $\mathcal{TYY} = \{(t, y, y') : y = Q(t, v), y' = Q(t, v'), (t, v, v') \in \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}\}$. Then, there exist two vanishing sequences ε_n and s_n such that*

$$\sup_{(t,y,y') \in \mathcal{TYY}, |y - y'| \leq \max(\varepsilon_n, s_n \delta_n)} |J_n(t, y) - J_n(t, y')| = o(\delta_n),$$

$$\sup_{(t,y) \in \mathcal{TY}} |J_n(t, y)| s_n = o(\varepsilon_n), \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{(t,y) \in \mathcal{TY}} |J_n(t, y)|^2 s_n = o(\delta_n).$$

Lemma I.2. *If Assumption 10 holds, then*

$$\frac{(F + s_n J_n)^{\leftarrow}(t, v) - F^{\leftarrow}(t, v)}{s_n} + \frac{J_n(t, F^{\leftarrow}(t, v))}{f(t, F^{\leftarrow}(t, v))} = o(\delta_n)$$

uniformly over $(t, v) \in \mathcal{TV}_\varepsilon$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $F(t,y)$ is monotonically increasing in y. Let $\xi(t,v) = F^{\leftarrow}(t,v)$ and $\xi_n(t,v) = (F + s_n J_n)^{\leftarrow}(t,v)$. Since for n sufficiently large, $\sup_{(t,v)\in\mathcal{TV}_\varepsilon} s_n|J_n)^{\leftarrow}(t,v)| < \varepsilon$ and the definition of V_ε, we can choose $\xi(t,v) \in \mathcal{Y}_t$ and $\xi_n(t,v) \in \mathcal{Y}_t$. In addition, since F is differentiable, we have $F(t,\xi(t,v)) = v$. Denote $\eta_n(t,v) = \min(s_n\delta_n^2, \xi_n(t,v) - \underline{y}_t)$. Then, the definition of the inverse function implies that

$$(F + s_n J_n)(t, \xi_n(t,v) - \eta_n(t,v)) \le u \le (F + s_n J_n)(t, \xi_n(t,v)). \tag{I.3}$$

Since $f(t,y)$ is bounded uniformly in $(t,y) \in \mathcal{TY}$, we have

$$F(t, \xi_n(t,v) - \eta_n(t,v)) - u = F(t, \xi_n(t,v)) - F(t, \xi(t,v)) + o(s_n\delta_n)$$

and

$$|s_n J_n(t, \xi_n(t,v) - \eta_n(t,v))| \le \sup_{(t,y)\in\mathcal{TY}} s_n|J_n(t,y)|.$$

Therefore,

$$-\sup_{(t,y)\in\mathcal{TY}} s_n|J_n(t,y)| \le F(t,\xi_n(t,v)) - F(t,\xi(t,v)) \le \sup_{(t,y)\in\mathcal{TY}} s_n|J_n(t,y)| + o(s_n\delta_n).$$

Since $f(t,y)$ is bounded and bounded away from zero, we have

$$|\xi_n(t,v) - \xi(t,v)| = O(\sup_{(t,y)\in\mathcal{TY}} s_n|J_n(t,y)|) + o(s_n\delta_n) = o(\max(\varepsilon_n, s_n\delta_n)).$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&F(t,\xi_n(t,v) - \eta_n(t,v)) - F(t,\xi(t,v)) + s_n J_n(t,\xi_n(t,v) - \eta_n(t,v)) \\
\ge& F(t,\xi_n(t,v)) - F(t,\xi(t,v)) + o(s_n\delta_n) + s_n J_n(t,\xi(t,v)) - s_n \sup|J_n(t,y) - J_n(t,y')| \\
\ge& f(t,\xi(t,v))(\xi_n(t,v) - \xi(t,v)) + s_n J_n(t,\xi(t,v)) - O(\sup_{(t,y)\in\mathcal{TY}} s_n^2|J_n(t,y)|^2) - o(s_n^2\delta_n^2) - o(s_n\delta_n) \\
\ge& f(t,\xi(t,v))(\xi_n(t,v) - \xi(t,v)) + s_n J_n(t,\xi(t,v)) - o(s_n\delta_n).
\end{aligned}$$

where the supremum in the second line is taken over $(t,y,y') \in \mathcal{TYY}$, $|y-y'| \le \max(\varepsilon_n, s_n\delta_n)$ and the third line is because $f'(t,y)$ is bounded uniformly in $(t,y) \in \mathcal{TY}$.

On the other hand, by (I.3),

$$F(t,\xi_n(t,v) - \eta_n(t,v)) - F(t,\xi(t,v)) + s_n J_n(t,\xi_n(t,v) - \eta_n(t,v)) \le 0.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\frac{(\xi_n(t,v)-\xi(t,v))}{s_n}+\frac{J_n(t,\xi(t,v))}{f(t,\xi(t,v))}\leq o(\delta_n). \tag{I.4}$$

Similarly, we can show that

$$\begin{aligned}&F(t,\xi_n(t,v))-F(t,\xi(t,v))+s_nJ_n(t,\xi_n(t,v))\\ \leq& f(t,\xi(t,v))(\xi_n(t,v)-\xi(t,v))+s_nJ_n(t,\xi(t,v))+o(s_n\delta_n).\end{aligned}$$

The RHS of (I.3) implies that

$$F(t,\xi_n(t,v))-F(t,\xi(t,v))+s_nJ_n(t,\xi_n(t,v))\geq 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{(\xi_n(t,v)-\xi(t,v))}{s_n}+\frac{J_n(t,\xi(t,v))}{f(t,\xi(t,v))}\geq -o(\delta_n). \tag{I.5}$$

(I.4) and (I.5) imply that

$$\frac{(\xi_n(t,v)-\xi(t,v))}{s_n}+\frac{J_n(t,\xi(t,v))}{f(t,\xi(t,v))}= o(\delta_n),$$

uniformly over $(t,v)\in\mathcal{TV}$. □

J A maximal inequality for the second order P-degenerate U-process

Let $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be sequence of i.i.d. random variables taking values in a measurable space $(\mathcal{X},\mathcal{X})$ with common distribution P. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a class of real-valued, symmetric functions with a nonnegative envelope F, i.e. $\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}}|f(\cdot,\cdot)|\leq F(\cdot,\cdot)$. Let

$$M\equiv\sup_{(x_1,x_2)\in\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X}}F(x_1,x_2)<\infty,$$

$l(x)=\mathbb{E}f^2(x,\cdot)$, $\mathcal{L}=\{l:f\in\mathcal{F}\}$ with envelope $L(x)$, and

$$M_L=\sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}}L(x)<\infty.$$

In addition, denote

$$\sigma_2^2 = \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}f^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_1^2 = \sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}} \mathbb{E}l^2.$$

f is P-degenerate, i.e. $\mathcal{P}f(x_1,\cdot) = 0$ for all $x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$. $S_n(f) = \sum_{1\le i\neq j\le n} f(X_i, X_j)$. $\mathcal{U}_n$ is the empirical U-process that place probability mass $\frac{1}{n(n-1)}$ on each pair of (X_i, X_j), i.e. $\mathcal{U}_n f = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} S_n(f)$.

Lemma J.1. *If there exist constant A and v (potentially depend on n) such that*

$$\sup_Q N(\varepsilon||F||_Q, e_Q, \mathcal{F}) \le \left(\frac{A}{e}\right)^v,$$

then

$$\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |\mathcal{U}_n f| = O_p\left(\frac{(\sigma_2+\pi)v}{n}\log\left(\frac{A||F||_{P,2}}{\sigma_2}\right) + \frac{M}{n^2}v^2\log^2\left(\frac{A||F||_{P,2}}{\sigma_2}\right)\right),$$

where $\pi^2 \equiv \sqrt{\frac{v\sigma_1^2}{n}\log\left(\frac{2A||L||_{P,2}}{\sigma_1}\right)} + \frac{v||M_L||_{P,2}}{n}\log\left(\frac{2A||L||_{P,2}}{\sigma_1}\right)$.

Proof.

Step 1: Symmetrization

We symmetrize the U-process using Rademacher random variables. Take an independent copy $Y_1, Y_2, \cdots, Y_n$ of $X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n$ from P and define

$$T_n^0(f) = \sum_{1\le i\le n} \eta_i\eta_j(f(X_i, X_j) - f(X_i, Y_j) - f(Y_i, X_j) + f(Y_i, Y_j)),$$

and

$$S_n^0(f) = \sum_{1\le i\neq j\le n} \eta_i\eta_j f(X_i, X_j)$$

where $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a sequence of Rademacher random variables. Then, by Lemma 1 of Nolan and Pollard (1987),

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |S_n(f)| \le \mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |T_n^0(f)| \le 4\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |S_n^0(f)|.$$

Define $\mathcal{U}_n^0(f) = S_n^0(f)/(n(n-1))$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n(f)| \le 4\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0(f)|. \tag{J.1}$$

This implies that we can focus on bounding $\mathbb{E}|U_n^0(f)|$.

Step 2: Entropy integral inequality

Following Corollary 4 of Nolan and Pollard (1987) with T_n^0 replaced by S_n^0, we have

$$P_\eta(S_n^0(f) > x) \leq 2\exp(-\frac{x}{13(S_n f^2)^{1/2}}).$$

This means, for a realization $(x_1, \cdots, x_n)$,

$$||\sum_{1\leq i\neq j\leq n} \eta_i\eta_j f(x_i, x_j)||_{\psi_1} \lesssim [\sum_{1\leq i\neq j\leq n} f^2(x_i, x_j)]^{1/2}$$

where $||\cdot||_{\psi_1}$ is the Orlicz norm with $\psi_1(x) = \exp(x) - 1$.

Let $\sigma_n^2 = \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{U}_n f^2$ and $J(\delta) = \int_0^\delta \lambda(\varepsilon)d\varepsilon$ where $\lambda(\varepsilon) = 1 + \sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon||F||_{Q,2}, e_Q, \mathcal{F})$, which is nonincreasing in ε. Then by Lemma 5 in Nolan and Pollard (1987), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{P}_\eta n \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |\mathcal{U}^0(f)| \lesssim & \int_0^{\sigma_n} (1 + \log N(\varepsilon, e_{U_n}, \mathcal{F}))d\varepsilon \\
\lesssim & ||F||_{\mathcal{U}_n,2} \int_0^{\frac{\sigma_n}{||F||_{\mathcal{U}_n,2}}} (1 + \log N(\varepsilon||F||_{\mathcal{U}_n,2}, e_{U_n}, \mathcal{F}))d\varepsilon \\
\lesssim & ||F||_{\mathcal{U}_n,2} \int_0^{\frac{\sigma_n}{||F||_{\mathcal{U}_n,2}}} (1 + \sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon||F||_{Q,2}, e_Q, \mathcal{F}))d\varepsilon \\
\lesssim & ||F||_{\mathcal{U}_n,2} J\left(\frac{\sigma_n}{||F||_{\mathcal{U}_n,2}}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation w.r.t. $(X_1, X_2, \cdots, X_n)$ on both sides, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{P}n \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |\mathcal{U}^0(f)| \leq \mathbb{E}\left[||F||_{\mathcal{U}_n,2} J(\frac{\sigma_n}{||F||_{\mathcal{U}_n,2}})\right].$$

The following lemma is borrowed from Chernozhukov et al. (2014):

Lemma J.2. *Write $J(\delta)$ for $J(\delta, \mathcal{F}, F)$ and suppose that $J(1) < \infty$. Then*

1. *$\delta \mapsto J(\delta)$ is concave.*
2. *$J(c\delta) \leq cJ(\delta)$, $\forall c \geq 1$.*
3. *$\delta \mapsto J(\delta)/\delta$ is nonincreasing.*
4. *The map $(x, y) \mapsto J(\sqrt{x/y})\sqrt{y}$ is concave for $(x, y) \in [0, +\infty) \times (0, +\infty)$.*

Although Chernozhukov et al. (2014) proved this lemma for

$$\lambda(\varepsilon) = \sqrt{1 + \sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon ||F||_{Q,2}, e_Q, \mathcal{F})},$$

their proofs work for $\lambda(\varepsilon) = 1 + \sup_Q \log N(\varepsilon ||F||_{Q,2}, e_Q, \mathcal{F})$, as well. Therefore, by Jensen's inequality, we have

$$Z \equiv \mathcal{P}n \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |\mathcal{U}^0(f)| \leq ||F||_{P,2} J\left(\frac{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\sigma_n^2}}{||F||_{P,2}}\right). \tag{J.2}$$

Step 3: Bound $\mathbb{E}\sigma_n^2$

The key is to bound $\mathbb{E}\sigma_n^2$. Let $\sigma_2^2 = \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}f^2$, $l(x) = \mathbb{E}f^2(x,\cdot)$, $\mathcal{L} = \{l : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$ with envelope $L(x) = \mathbb{E}F^2(x,\cdot)$, $h(x_1,x_2) = f^2(x_1,x_2) - l(x_1) - l(x_2) + \mathbb{E}f^2(X_1,X_2)$, and $\mathcal{H} = \{h : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$. Then we have

$$f^2(x_1,x_2) = \mathbb{E}f^2(X_1,X_2) + l(x_1) - \mathbb{E}l(X_1) + l(x_2) - \mathbb{E}l(X_2) + h(x_1,x_2).$$

Therefore, by triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\sigma_n^2 =& \mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |\mathcal{U}_n h + \mathbb{E}f^2(X_1,X_2) + 2(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})l(\cdot)| \\
\leq& \sigma_2^2 + \mathbb{E}\sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}} |\mathcal{U}_n h| + 2\mathbb{E}\sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}} |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})l(\cdot)| \\
\leq& \sigma_2^2 + \frac{1}{n(n-1)}\mathbb{E}\sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}} |T_n^0 h| + 2\mathbb{E}\sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}} |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})l(\cdot)| \\
=& \sigma_2^2 + \frac{1}{n(n-1)}\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |T_n^0 f^2| + 2\mathbb{E}\sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}} |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})l(\cdot)| \\
\leq& \sigma_2^2 + 4\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0 f^2| + 2\mathbb{E}\sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}} |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})l(\cdot)|.
\end{aligned}$$

Step 4: A contraction inequality

Lemma J.3. *If* $\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |f| \leq M$, *then*

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0 f^2| \leq M\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0 f|.$$

Proof. Note that $\{\eta_i\eta_j\}_{1\leq i<j\leq n}$ takes each value of $\{a_{i,j}^0\}_{1\leq i<j\leq n} \in \{1,-1\}^{n(n-1)/2}$ with equal probability. For $j < i$, let $a_{j,i}^0 = a_{i,j}^0$. Then, for any symmetric $\{b_{i,j}\}_{1\leq i\neq j\leq n}$, $\{\eta_i\eta_j a_{i,j}^0 b_{i,j}\}_{1\leq i\neq j\leq n}$ and $\{\eta_i\eta_j b_{i,j}\}_{1\leq i\neq j\leq n}$ have the same distribution. Let $(x_1,\cdots,x_n)$ be

an arbitrary realization of $(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$ and $f_{i,j} = f(x_i, x_j)$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0 M f_{i,j}| = \mathbb{E}_\eta \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0 f_{i,j} M a_{i,j}^0|. \tag{J.3}$$

In addition, $\mathbb{E}\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0 f_{i,j} M a_{i,j}|$ is convex in $\{a_{i,j}\}_{1\le i\neq j\le n}$. So for any $|a_{i,j}| \le 1$, $a_{i,j} = a_{j,i}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0 f_{i,j} M a_{i,j}|$$

obtains its maximal at extreme points, i.e. some $\{a_{i,j}^0\}_{1\le i\neq j\le n}$ with $a_{i,j}^0 = a_{j,i}^0$. This and (J.3) imply that, for any any $|a_{i,j}| \le 1$, $a_{i,j} = a_{j,i}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0 f_{i,j} M a_{i,j}| \le \mathbb{E}_\eta \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0 f_{i,j} M|.$$

Let $a_{i,j} = f_{i,j}/M$, then we have,

$$\mathbb{E}_\eta \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0 f_{i,j}^2| \le M \mathbb{E}_\eta \sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |U_n^0 f_{i,j}|.$$

Taking expectations w.r.t. $(X_1, \cdots, X_n)$, we have the desired result. □

Step 5: The upper bound
Since

$$\sup_Q N(\varepsilon ||F||_Q, e_Q, \mathcal{F}) \le \left(\frac{A}{e}\right)^v,$$

then by Lemma L.2 in Belloni et al. (2017),

$$\sup_Q N(\varepsilon ||L||_Q, e_Q, \mathcal{L}) \le \left(\frac{2A}{e}\right)^v.$$

Denote $\sigma_1^2 = \sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}} \mathbb{E} l^2$, $L(x) = \mathcal{P}F(x, \cdot)$, and $M_L = \max_{1\le i\le n} L(X_i)$, then we have

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{l\in\mathcal{L}} |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})l(\cdot)| \lesssim \pi^2 \equiv \sqrt{\frac{v\sigma_1^2}{n}\log(\frac{2A||L||_{P,2}}{\sigma_1})} + \frac{v||M_L||_{P,2}}{n}\log(\frac{2A||L||_{P,2}}{\sigma_1})$$

and thus

$$\mathbb{E}\sigma_n^2 \lesssim \sigma_2^2 + \pi^2 + MZ/n \lesssim ||F||_{P,2}^2 \max(\Delta^2, DZ) \tag{J.4}$$

where $\Delta^2 = \max(\sigma_2^2, \pi^2)/||F||_{P,2}^2$, $Z \equiv \mathcal{P}n\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} |\mathcal{U}^0(f)|$, and $D = M/(n||F||_{P,2}^2)$. Plugging

(J.4) in (J.2), we have

$$Z = ||F||_{P,2} J(C \max(\Delta, \sqrt{DZ})) \lesssim ||F||_{P,2} J(\max(\Delta, \sqrt{DZ})).$$

1. $\sqrt{DZ} \leq \Delta$. We have $Z \lesssim ||F||_{P,2} J(\Delta)$. In addition, recall $\delta = \sigma_2 / ||F||_{P,2}$, then $\Delta \geq \delta$ and
$$J(\Delta) = \Delta \frac{J(\Delta)}{\Delta} \leq \Delta \frac{J(\delta)}{\delta} = \max\left(J(\delta), \frac{\pi J(\delta)}{\delta ||F||_{P,2}} \right).$$

2. $\sqrt{DZ} > \Delta$. Then
$$J(\Delta, \sqrt{DZ}) \leq J(\sqrt{DZ}) = \sqrt{DZ} \frac{J(\sqrt{DZ})}{\sqrt{DZ}} \leq \sqrt{DZ} \frac{J(\Delta)}{\Delta} \leq \sqrt{DZ} \frac{J(\delta)}{\delta}.$$
So $Z \leq C ||F||_{P,2} \sqrt{DZ} \frac{J(\delta)}{\delta}$, or equivalently,
$$Z \lesssim ||F||_{P,2}^2 D \frac{J^2(\delta)}{\delta^2} \lesssim ||F||_{P,2} \frac{M}{n ||F||_{P,2}} \frac{J^2(\delta)}{\delta^2}.$$

So overall,
$$Z \lesssim ||F||_{P,2} \max\left(J(\delta), \frac{\pi J(\delta)}{\delta ||F||_{P,2}}, \frac{M}{n ||F||_{P,2}} \frac{J^2(\delta)}{\delta^2} \right).$$

Note that $J(\delta) \leq C \delta v \log(\frac{A}{\delta})$. So

$$Z \equiv \mathcal{P} n \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |\mathcal{U}^0(f)| \lesssim (\sigma_2 + \pi) v \log(\frac{A ||F||_{P,2}}{\sigma_2}) + \frac{M}{n} v^2 \log^2(\frac{A ||F||_{P,2}}{\sigma_2}).$$

Then, (J.1) implies the desired result. □

K Technical lemmas

Lemma K.1 and K.3 are closely related to Lemma J.6 and O.2 in Belloni et al. (2017) with one major difference: we have an additional kernel function which affects the rate of convergence. We follow the proving strategies in Belloni et al. (2017) in general, but use the local compatibility condition established in Lemma 3.1 when needed. We include these proofs mainly for completeness. Lemma K.2 and K.6 are proved without referring to the theory of moderate deviations for self-normalized sums, in contrast to the proof of Lemma J.1 in Belloni et al. (2017). Consequently, we have the additional l_n term but avoid one

constraint on the rates of p, s, and n, as well.

Lemma K.1. *If Assumption 3–6 hold, then*

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta_{t,u} K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} = O_p(\log(p)s)^{1/2} n^{-1/2}$$

and

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||\delta_{t,u}||_1 = O_p(\log(p)s^2)^{1/2}(nh)^{-1/2}.$$

Proof. We define the following three events.

$$E_1 = \{C_r(\log(p)s/n)^{1/2} \geq \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||\frac{r_{t,u}^{\phi}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}} K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}\},$$

$$E_2 = \left\{\frac{\lambda}{n} \geq \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} C_\lambda \left|\left|\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_n\left[\xi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})f(X)\right]\right|\right|_\infty\right\},$$

and

$$E_3 = \{l\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0} \leq \widehat{\Psi}_{t,u} \leq L\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0} \quad \text{and} \quad C_\psi/2 \leq \inf_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}||_\infty \leq \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}||_\infty \leq 2/C_\psi\}$$

where l, L, and C_ψ are defined in Lemma K.5 and the generic penalty loading matrix $\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u} = \widehat{\Phi}_{t,u}^k$ for $k = 0, \cdots, K$.

Note that $\lambda = l_n(\log(p)nh)^{1/2}$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, we can choose $C_r = C_r(\varepsilon)$, $C_\lambda = C_\lambda(\varepsilon)$ with $C_\lambda(\varepsilon)l > 1$, and $\lambda = C_\lambda^2(\log(p)hn)^{1/2}$ such that $P(E_1) > 1-\varepsilon$ and

$$P(E_2) = P\left(\frac{\lambda}{n} \geq C_\lambda \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} \left|\left|\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}\mathcal{P}_n\left[\xi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})f(X)\right]\right|\right|_\infty\right) \geq 1-\varepsilon$$

by Assumption 3 and Lemma K.2, respectively. In addition, by Lemma K.5, $P(E_3) > 1-\varepsilon_n$ for some deterministic sequence $\varepsilon_n \downarrow 0$.

From now on, we assume E_1, E_2, and E_3 hold with constant C_r, C_λ, l, and L, which occurs with probability greater than $1-2\varepsilon-\varepsilon_n$. Let $\delta_{t,u} = \hat{\theta}_{t,u} - \theta_{t,u}$, $T_{t,u} = \text{Supp}(\theta_{t,u})$,

$$\Gamma_{t,u} = ||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta_{t,u} K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2},$$

and

$$\tilde{c} = \max(4(LC_\lambda + 1)(lC_\lambda - 1)^{-1}C_\psi^{-2}, 1).$$

Then, under E_3,

$$\tilde{c} \geq \max((LC_\lambda + 1)/(lC_\lambda - 1) \sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}||_\infty ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty, 1) \geq 1.$$

By construction,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{t,u}(\hat{\theta}_{t,u}) - Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u}) \leq & \frac{\lambda}{n}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u}\theta_{t,u}||_1 - \frac{\lambda}{n}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u}\hat{\theta}_{t,u}||_1 \\ \leq & \frac{\lambda}{n}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u}(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}}||_1 - \frac{\lambda}{n}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u}(\hat{\theta}_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}^c}||_1 \\ = & \frac{\lambda}{n}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u}(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}}||_1 - \frac{\lambda}{n}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u}(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}^c}||_1 \\ \leq & \frac{\lambda L}{n}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}}||_1 - \frac{\lambda l}{n}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}^c}||_1. \end{aligned} \tag{K.1}$$

Because the kernel function $K(\cdot)$ is nonnegative, $Q_{t,u}(\theta)$ is concave in θ. Therefore,

$$Q_{t,u}(\hat{\theta}_{t,u}) - Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u}) \geq \partial_\theta Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u})'\delta_{t,u}.$$

Let $S_{t,u} = -\mathcal{P}_n f(X)\xi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})$ and $\xi_{t,u} = Y_u - \phi_{t,u}(X)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial_\theta Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u})'\delta_{t,u}| = & |\mathcal{P}_n(\Lambda(f(X)'\theta_{t,u}) - Y_u)K(\frac{T-t}{h})f(X)'\delta_{t,u}| \\ = & |\mathcal{P}_n r_{t,u}^\phi f(X)'\delta_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) + S_{t,u}'\delta_{t,u}| \\ \leq & ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}S_{t,u}||_\infty ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}\delta_{t,u}||_1 + ||\frac{r_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u} \\ \leq & \frac{\lambda}{nC_\lambda}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}\delta_{t,u}||_1 + ||\frac{r_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u} \\ \leq & \frac{\lambda}{nC_\lambda}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}}||_1 - \frac{\lambda}{nC_\lambda}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}^c}||_1 + ||\frac{r_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u} \end{aligned} \tag{K.2}$$

Combining (K.1) and (K.2), we have

$$\frac{\lambda(lC_\lambda - 1)}{nC_\lambda}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}^c}||_1 \leq \frac{\lambda(LC_\lambda + 1)}{nC_\lambda}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}}||_1 + ||\frac{r_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u}.$$

Then,

$$||(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}^c}||_1 \leq \frac{LC_\lambda + 1}{lC_\lambda - 1}||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}^c}||_1 + \frac{nC_\lambda||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty}{\lambda(C_\lambda l - 1)}||\frac{r_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u}$$
$$\leq \tilde{c}||(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}}||_1 + \frac{nC_\lambda||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty}{\lambda(C_\lambda l - 1)}||\frac{r_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u}.$$

If $\delta_{t,u} \notin \Delta_{2\tilde{c},t,u}$, i.e. $||(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}^c}||_1 \geq 2\tilde{c}||(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}}||_1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
||\delta_{t,u}||_1 \leq & (1 + \frac{1}{2\tilde{c}})||(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}^c}||_1 \\
\leq & (\tilde{c} + \frac{1}{2})||(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}}||_1 + (1 + \frac{1}{2\tilde{c}})\frac{nC_\lambda||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty}{\lambda(C_\lambda l - 1)}||\frac{r_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u} \\
\leq & (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\tilde{c}})||(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}^c}||_1 + (1 + \frac{1}{2\tilde{c}})\frac{nC_\lambda||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty}{\lambda(C_\lambda l - 1)}||\frac{r_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u} \\
\leq & (\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4\tilde{c}})||\delta_{t,u}||_1 + (1 + \frac{1}{2\tilde{c}})\frac{nC_\lambda||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty}{\lambda(C_\lambda l - 1)}||\frac{r_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that $\tilde{c} \geq 1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
||\delta_{t,u}||_1 \leq & \left[\frac{4\tilde{c} + 2}{2\tilde{c} - 1}\right]\frac{nC_\lambda||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty}{\lambda(C_\lambda l - 1)}||\frac{r_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u} \\
\leq & 6\frac{nC_\lambda||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty}{\lambda(C_\lambda l - 1)}||\frac{r_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u} = I_{t,u}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\underline{\kappa} = \inf_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} \min_{\delta\in\Delta_{2\tilde{c},t,u}} \frac{||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}}{\sqrt{h}||\delta_{T_{t,u}}||_2}.$$

If $\delta_{t,u} \in \Delta_{2\tilde{c},t,u}$, then

$$||(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}}||_1 \leq \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\underline{\kappa}\sqrt{h}}\Gamma_{t,u} = II_{t,u}.$$

In this case, $||\delta_{t,u}||_1 \leq (1+2\tilde{c})II_{t,u}$. So overall,

$$||\delta_{t,u}||_1 \leq I_{t,u} + (1+2\tilde{c})II_{t,u} \leq \left(6\frac{nC_\lambda||\widehat{\Psi}^{-1}_{t,u,0}||_\infty}{\lambda(C_\lambda l - 1)}||\frac{r^\phi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}}||_{P_n,2} + \frac{(1+2\tilde{c})\sqrt{s}}{\underline{\kappa}\sqrt{h}}\right)\Gamma_{t,u} \tag{K.3}$$

and $\delta_{t,u} \in A_{t,u} \equiv \Delta_{2\tilde{c},t,u} \cup \{\delta : ||\delta||_1 \leq I_{t,u}\}$.

Let $\tilde{r}^\phi_{t,u} = \Lambda^{-1}(\Lambda(f(X)'\theta_{t,u}) + r^\phi_{t,u}) - f(X)'\theta_{t,u}$ and

$$\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}} = \inf_{\delta \in A_{t,u}} \frac{[\mathcal{P}_n \omega_{t,u}|f(X)'\delta|^2 K(\frac{T-t}{h})]^{3/2}}{\mathcal{P}_n[\omega_{t,u}|f(X)'\delta|^3 K(\frac{T-t}{h})]}.$$

Then, w.p.a.1., for some $\overline{r}^\phi_{t,u}$ between 0 and $r^\phi_{t,u}$,

$$\begin{aligned}|\tilde{r}^\phi_{t,u}| =& \{[\Lambda(f(X)'\theta_{t,u}) + \overline{r}^\phi_{t,u}][1 - \Lambda(f(X)'\theta_{t,u}) - \overline{r}^\phi_{t,u}]\}^{-1}|r^\phi_{t,u}| \\ \in& [4|r^\phi_{t,u}|, \{(\underline{C}/2)(1-\underline{C}/2)\}^{-1}|r^\phi_{t,u}|],\end{aligned}$$

where the second line holds because $\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} ||r^\phi_{t,u}||_{P,\infty} \xrightarrow{p} 0$. In addition, by Lemma K.3 and (K.1)–(K.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\min(\frac{1}{3}\Gamma^2_{t,u}, \frac{\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}}}{3}\Gamma_{t,u}) \\ \leq& Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u}+\delta) - Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u}) - \partial_\theta Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u})'\delta + 2||\frac{\tilde{r}^\phi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u} \\ \leq& \frac{\lambda}{n}(L + \frac{1}{C_\lambda})||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}(\delta_{t,u})_{T_{t,u}}||_1 - \frac{\lambda}{n}(l - \frac{1}{C_\lambda})||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}(\delta_{t,u})_{T^c_{t,u}}||_1 + 3||\frac{\tilde{r}^\phi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u} \\ \leq& \frac{\lambda}{n}(L + \frac{1}{C_\lambda})||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}||_\infty||\delta_{t,u}||_1 + 3||\frac{\tilde{r}^\phi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}}||_{P_n,2}\Gamma_{t,u} \\ \leq& \left(9\tilde{c}||\frac{\tilde{r}^\phi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}}||_{P_n,2} + \frac{\lambda}{n}(L + \frac{1}{C_\lambda})||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}||_\infty\frac{(1+2\tilde{c})\sqrt{s}}{\underline{\kappa}\sqrt{h}}\right)\Gamma_{t,u},\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds because $|r^\phi_{t,u}| \leq |\tilde{r}^\phi_{t,u}|$. If

$$\overline{q}_{A_{u,r}} > 3\left\{9\tilde{c}||\frac{\tilde{r}^\phi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}}||_{P_n,2} + \frac{\lambda}{n}(L + \frac{1}{C_\lambda})||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}||_\infty\frac{(1+2\tilde{c})\sqrt{s}}{\underline{\kappa}\sqrt{h}}\right\}, \tag{K.4}$$

then

$$\Gamma_{t,u} \leq 3\left\{9\tilde{c}||\frac{\tilde{r}^{\phi}_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}}||_{P_n,2} + \frac{\lambda}{n}(L+\frac{1}{C_\lambda})||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}||_\infty \frac{(1+2\tilde{c})\sqrt{s}}{\underline{\kappa}\sqrt{h}}\right\} \tag{K.5}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}||\delta_{t,u}||_1 \leq &\left(6\frac{nC_\lambda||\widehat{\Psi}^{-1}_{t,u,0}||_\infty}{\lambda(C_\lambda l-1)}||\frac{r^{\phi}_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}}||_{P_n,2} + \frac{(1+2\tilde{c})\sqrt{s}}{\underline{\kappa}\sqrt{h}}\right)\\ &\times 3\left\{9\tilde{c}||\frac{\tilde{r}^{\phi}_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}}||_{P_n,2} + \frac{\lambda}{n}(L+\frac{1}{C_\lambda})||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}||_\infty \frac{(1+2\tilde{c})\sqrt{s}}{\underline{\kappa}\sqrt{h}}\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{K.6}$$

Since E_1 holds,

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}}||\frac{\tilde{r}^{\phi}_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}}||_{P_n,2} \leq [\underline{C}/2(1-\underline{C}/2)]^{-1}C_r(\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)s}{n}}).$$

Further note that $\lambda = l_n(\log(p)nh)^{1/2}$. Hence, if (K.4) holds, then (K.5) and (K.6) imply that

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}}\Gamma_{t,u} \leq C_\Gamma l_n(\log(p)s)^{1/2}n^{-1/2}$$

with $C_\Gamma = 3(9\tilde{c}[\underline{C}/2(1-\underline{C}/2)]^{-1}C_r + C_\lambda(LC_\lambda+1)2C_\psi(1+2\tilde{c})/\underline{\kappa})$ and

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}}||\delta_{t,u}||_1 \leq C_1 l_n(\log(p)s^2)^{1/2}(nh)^{-1/2}$$

with $C_1 = \left[(\frac{6C_r}{C_\lambda(C_\lambda l-1)}) + \frac{1+2\tilde{c}}{\underline{\kappa}}\right]C_\Gamma$, which are the desired results.

Last, we verify (K.4). By Lemma K.3, if $l_n^2\log(p)s^2K_n^2/(nh)\to 0$, then

$$\frac{\overline{q}_{A_{u,r}}}{3\left\{9\tilde{c}||\frac{\tilde{r}^{\phi}_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}}||_{P_n,2} + \frac{\lambda}{n}(L+\frac{1}{C_\lambda})||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}||_\infty \frac{(1+2\tilde{c})\sqrt{s}}{\underline{\kappa}\sqrt{h}}\right\}} \geq c\sqrt{l_n^2\frac{nh}{\log(p)s^2K_n^2}} \to \infty.$$

This concludes the proof. □

Lemma K.2. *If Assumption 3–6 hold and $\xi_{t,u} = Y_u - \phi_{t,u}(X)$, then*

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}}\left|\left|\widehat{\Psi}^{-1}_{t,u,0}\mathcal{P}_n\left[\xi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})f(X)\right]\right|\right|_\infty = O_p((\log(p)h/n)^{1/2}).$$

Proof. Since $\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}$ is bounded away from zero w.p.a.1, uniformly over (t,u), we can just focus on bounding

$$\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}}\left|\left|\mathcal{P}_n\left[\xi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})f(X)\right]\right|\right|_\infty.$$

For j-th element, $1\leq j\leq p$,

$$|\mathbb{E}[\xi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})f_j(X)|\leq c\mathbb{E}|f_j(X)|h^3\leq c||f_j(X)||_{P,2}h^3\leq ch^3.$$

where c is a universal constant independent of (t,u,n). In addition, $nh^3/(\log(p)hn)^{1/2}\to 0$. So $\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}}||\mathbb{E}[\xi_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})f(X)||_\infty$ is asymptotically negligible. We focus on the centered term:

$$\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}}|(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathcal{P})g|$$

where $\mathcal{G}=\{\xi_{t,u}f_j(X)K(\frac{T-t}{h}):(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU},1\leq j\leq p\}$ with envelope $G=K_n$. In addition,

$$\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}}\mathbb{E}g^2\lesssim h$$

and

$$\sup_Q N(\mathcal{G},e_Q,\varepsilon||G||)\leq p\left(\frac{A}{\varepsilon}\right)^v$$

for some $A>e$ and $v>0$. So by Corollary 5.1 of Chernozhukov et al. (2014), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}}|(\mathbb{P}_n-\mathcal{P})g|\leq(\log(p)h/n)^{1/2}+\log(p)K_n/n\lesssim(\log(p)h/n)^{1/2}$$

because $\log(p)K_n^2/(nh)\to 0$. □

Lemma K.3. *Let* $\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}}=\inf_{\delta\in A_{t,u}}\frac{[\mathcal{P}_n\omega_{t,u}|f(X)'\delta|^2K(\frac{T-t}{h})]^{3/2}}{\mathcal{P}_n\omega_{t,u}|f(X)'\delta|^3K(\frac{T-t}{h})}$ *and* $s_{t,u}=||\theta_{t,u}||_0$. *If events* E_1, E_2, *and* E_3 *defined in the proof of Lemma K.1 hold, then, for any* $(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}$, *and* $\delta\in A_{t,u}$,

$$Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u}+\delta)-Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u})-\partial_\theta Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u})'\delta+2||\frac{\tilde{r}_{t,u}^\phi K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}$$
$$\geq\min(\frac{1}{3}||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}^2,\frac{\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}}}{3}||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2})$$

and w.p.a.1,

$$\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}} \geq \frac{1}{K_n} \min\left(\frac{\underline{\kappa}\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{s_{t,u}}(1+2\tilde{c})}, \frac{(\lambda/n)(lC_\lambda - 1)}{6c||\widehat{\Psi}^{-1}_{t,u,0}||_\infty || \frac{r^\phi_{t,u} K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}} ||_{P_n,2}} \right).$$

Proof.

$$Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u}+\delta) - Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u}) - \partial_\theta Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u})'\delta = \mathcal{P}_n[\tilde{g}_{t,u}(1) - \tilde{g}_{t,u}(0) - \tilde{g}'_{t,u}(0)]$$

where $\tilde{g}_{t,u}(s) = \log[1+\exp(f(X)'(\theta_{t,u}+s\delta))]K(\frac{T-t}{h})$. Let $g_{t,u}(s) = \log[1+\exp(f(X)'(\theta_{t,u}+s\delta)+\tilde{r}^\phi_{t,u})]K(\frac{T-t}{h})$. Then

$$g'_{t,u}(0) = (f(X)'\delta)\mathbb{E}(Y_u|X, T=t)K(\frac{T-t}{h}),$$

$$g''_{t,u}(0) = (f(X)'\delta)^2\mathbb{E}(Y_u|X, T=t)(1-\mathbb{E}(Y_u|X, T=t))K(\frac{T-t}{h}),$$

and

$$g'''_{t,u}(0) = (f(X)'\delta)^3\mathbb{E}(Y_u|X, T=t)(1-\mathbb{E}(Y_u|X, T=t))(1-2\mathbb{E}(Y_u|X, T=t))K(\frac{T-t}{h}).$$

By Lemma O.3 and O.4 in Belloni et al. (2017),

$$g_{t,u}(1) - g_{t,u}(0) - g'_{t,u}(0) \geq \omega_{t,u}K(\frac{T-t}{h})\left[\frac{(f(X)'\delta)^2}{2} - \frac{|f(X)'\delta|^3}{6}\right].$$

In addition, let $\Upsilon_{t,u}(s) = \tilde{g}_{t,u}(s) - g_{t,u}(s)$, then

$$|\Upsilon'_{t,u}(s)| \leq |\omega^{1/2}_{t,u} f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}| \left| \frac{\tilde{r}^\phi_{t,u} K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega^{1/2}_{t,u}} \right|.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}_n|\tilde{g}_{t,u}(1) - g_{t,u}(1) - (\tilde{g}_{t,u}(0) - g_{t,u}(0)) - (\tilde{g}'_{t,u}(0) - g'_{t,u}(0))| \\
=&\mathcal{P}_n|\Upsilon_{t,u}(1) - \Upsilon_{t,u}(0) - \Upsilon'_{t,u}(0)| \\
\leq&2\mathcal{P}_n|\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}|\left|\frac{\tilde{r}_{t,u}^{\phi} K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}\right| \\
\leq&2\Gamma_{t,u}\left|\left|\frac{\tilde{r}_{t,u}^{\phi} K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}\right|\right|_{P_n,2}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$F_{t,u}(\delta) \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{P}_n\omega_{t,u}(f(X)'\delta)^2 K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - \frac{1}{6}\mathcal{P}_n\omega_{t,u}|f(X)'\delta|^3 K(\frac{T-t}{h}),$$

where

$$F_{t,u}(\delta) = Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u}+\delta) - Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u}) - \partial_\theta Q_{t,u}(\theta_{t,u})'\delta + 2\Gamma_{t,u}\left|\left|\frac{\tilde{r}_{t,u}^{\phi} K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}\right|\right|_{P_n,2}.$$

Note that $F_{t,u}(\delta)$ is convex and $F_{t,u}(0) = 0$. If $\Gamma_{t,u} \equiv ||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} \leq \overline{q}_{A_{t,u}}$, then

$$\mathcal{P}_n\omega_{t,u}|f(X)'\delta|^3 K(\frac{T-t}{h}) \leq ||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}^2$$

and

$$F_{t,u}(\delta) \geq \frac{1}{3}\Gamma_{t,u}^2.$$

On the other hand, if $\Gamma_{t,u} > \overline{q}_{A_{t,u}}$, then let $\tilde{\delta} = \delta\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}}/\Gamma_{t,u} \in A_{t,u}$. Therefore,

$$F_{t,u}(\delta) \geq \frac{\Gamma_{t,u}}{\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}}} F_{t,u}(\tilde{\delta}) \geq \frac{\Gamma_{t,u}}{\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}}}\left(\frac{1}{3}||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\tilde{\delta} K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}^2\right) = \frac{\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}}}{3}\Gamma_{t,u}.$$

This concludes that

$$F_{t,u}(\delta) \geq \min(\frac{1}{3}\Gamma_{t,u}^2, \frac{\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}}}{3}\Gamma_{t,u}).$$

For the second result, note that

$$\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}} \geq \inf_{\delta \in A_{t,u}} \frac{||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}}{K_n||\delta||_1}.$$

If $\delta \in \Delta_{2\tilde{c},t,u}$, then

$$\frac{||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}}{K_n||\delta||_1} \geq \frac{||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}}{K_n||\delta_{T_{t,u}}||_2(1+2\tilde{c})s_{t,u}^{1/2}} \geq \frac{1}{K_n}\frac{\underline{\kappa}\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{s_{t,u}}(1+2\tilde{c})}.$$

If $||\delta||_1 \leq I_{t,u}$, where $I_{t,u}$ is defined in the proof of Lemma K.1, then

$$\frac{||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}}{K_n||\delta||_1} \geq \frac{||\omega_{t,u}^{1/2} f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}}{K_n I_{t,u}} \geq \frac{1}{K_n}\frac{(\lambda/n)(lC_\lambda - 1)}{6c||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty||\frac{r_{t,u}^{\phi} K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}}.$$

Combining two results, we obtain that

$$\overline{q}_{A_{t,u}} \geq \frac{1}{K_n}\min\left(\frac{\underline{\kappa}\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{s_{t,u}}(1+2\tilde{c})}, \frac{(\lambda/n)(lC_\lambda - 1)}{6c||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}^{-1}||_\infty||\frac{r_{t,u}^{\phi} K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}}{\omega_{t,u}^{1/2}}||_{P_n,2}}\right).$$

□

Lemma K.4. *If assumptions in Theorem 3.1 hold, then, there exists a positive constant c independent of (t,u,n) such that, w.p.a.1,*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},||\delta||_2=1,||\delta||_0\leq sl_n} ||f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2} h^{-1/2} \leq 2\underline{C}^{-1/2}\kappa''.$$

Proof. Following the same argument in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we have, w.p.a.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},||\delta||_2=1,||\delta||_0\leq sl_n} ||f(X)'\delta K(\frac{T-t}{h})^{1/2}||_{P_n,2}^2 \\
\leq &\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},||\delta||_2=1,||\delta||_0\leq sl_n} |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})(f(X)'\delta)^2 K(\frac{T-t}{h})| \\
&+ \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},||\delta||_2=1,||\delta||_0\leq sl_n} |\mathcal{P}(f(X)'\delta)^2 K(\frac{T-t}{h})| \\
\leq &O_p(h\pi_{n1}) + \underline{C}^{-1}h \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},||\delta||_2=1,||\delta||_0\leq sl_n} |\mathcal{P}(f(X)'\delta)^2| \\
\leq &o_p(h) + \underline{C}^{-1}h(\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},||\delta||_2=1,||\delta||_0\leq sl_n} |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})(f(X)'\delta)^2| + \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},||\delta||_2=1,||\delta||_0\leq sl_n} |\mathcal{P}_n(f(X)'\delta)^2|) \\
\leq &o_p(h) + \underline{C}^{-1}h(O_p(\pi_{n2}) + \kappa''^2) \\
\leq &2\underline{C}^{-1}\kappa''^2 h
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds because

$$\mathbb{E}(f(X)'\delta)^2 K(\frac{T-t}{h}) = \mathbb{E}(f(X)'\delta)^2 \int f_{t+hu}(X)K(u)du \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}(f(X)'\delta)^2}{\underline{C}}.$$

□

Lemma K.5. *If the assumptions in Theorem 3.1 hold, then there exists* $0 < C_\psi < 1$ *such that w.p.a.1,*

$$C_\psi/2 \leq \inf_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}||_\infty \leq \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}||_\infty \leq 2/C_\psi. \tag{K.7}$$

For any $k = 0, 1, \cdots, K$ *and* $\widehat{\Psi}^k_{t,u}$ *defined in Algorithm 3.1, there exists constant* $0 < C_k < 1$ *such that, w.p.a.1,*

$$C_k/2 \leq \inf_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}^k_t||_\infty \leq \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}^k_t||_\infty \leq 2C_k. \tag{K.8}$$

In addition, for any $k = 0, 1, \cdots, K$ *and* $\widehat{\Psi}^k_t$ *defined in Algorithm 3.1, there exists constant* $l < 1 < L$ *independent of* n, t, *and* k *such that, uniformly in* $t \in \mathcal{T}$ *and w.p.a.1,*

$$l\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0} \leq \widehat{\Psi}^k_{t,u} \leq L\widehat{\Psi}_{t,u,0}. \tag{K.9}$$

Proof. We only show the first result. The rest can be derived in a similar manner. In addition, analogous to the proof of Lemma K.7, we only need to compute

$$\mathbb{E}(Y_u - \phi_{t,u}(X))^2 f_j^2(X)K(\frac{T-t}{h})h^{-1}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}(Y_u - \phi_{t,u}(X))^2 f_j^2(X)K(\frac{T-t}{h})h^{-1} \\
=&\mathbb{E}\int\left[\phi_{t+hv,u}(X) - 2\phi_{t+hv,u}(X)\phi_{t,u}(X) + \phi^2_{t,u}(X)\right] f_{t+hv}(X)K(v)dv f_j^2(X) \\
\geq&\underline{C}\mathbb{E}\int\left[\phi_{t,u}(X)(1-\phi_{t,u}(X)) - h|\partial_t\phi_{\tilde{t},u}(X)||v|\right]K(v)dv f_j^2(X) \\
\geq&\underline{C}^2(1-\underline{C})\mathbb{E}f_j^2(X)/2 \geq C_\psi.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}(Y_u - \phi_{t,u}(X))^2 f_j^2(X) K(\frac{T-t}{h}) h^{-1} \\
=&\mathbb{E}\int \left[\phi_{t+hv,u}(X) - 2\phi_{t+hv,u}(X)\phi_{t,u}(X) + \phi_{t,u}^2(X)\right] f_{t+hv}(X) K(v) dv f_j^2(X) \\
\leq& \underline{C}\mathbb{E}\int \left[\phi_{t,u}(X)(1-\phi_{t,u}(X)) + h|\partial_t \phi_{\tilde{t},u}(X)||v|\right] K(v) dv f_j^2(X) \\
\leq& 2\underline{C}\mathbb{E} f_j^2(X) \leq 1/C_\psi.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma K.6. *If the assumptions in Theorem 3.2 hold, then*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\mathcal{P}_n \widehat{\Psi}_{t0}^{-1} \xi_t(X) f(X)||_\infty = O_p((\log(p)/(nh))^{1/2}).$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\xi_t(X) f_j(X) : t \in \mathcal{T}, j = 1, \cdots, p\}$ with envelope $F = K_n/h$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\mathcal{P}_n \widehat{\Psi}_{t,0}^{-1} \xi_t(X) f(X)||_\infty \leq& \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,0}^{-1}||_\infty \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\mathcal{P}_n \xi_t(X) f(X)||_\infty \\
\leq& O_p(1)(||\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P}||_\mathcal{F} + ||\mathcal{P}||_\mathcal{F}) \\
\leq& O_p(1)(||\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P}||_\mathcal{F} + O(h^2))
\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality because $\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,0}^{-1}||_\infty = O_p(1)$ by Lemma K.7.

Next, we bound the term $||\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P}||_\mathcal{F}$. Note that there exist some constants A and v independent of n such that the entropy of $\mathcal{F}$ is bounded by

$$\sup_Q N(\mathcal{F}, e_Q, \varepsilon ||F||_{Q,2}) \leq p\left(\frac{A}{\varepsilon}\right)^v.$$

In addition, $\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E} f^2 \lesssim h^{-1}$. Therefore, by Corollary 5.1 of Chernozhukov et al. (2014),

$$||\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P}||_\mathcal{F} \lesssim O_p\left((\log(p)/(nh))^{1/2} + K_n^2 \log(p)/(nh)\right) = O_p((\log(p)/(nh))^{1/2}).$$

This concludes the proof. □

Lemma K.7. *If the assumptions in Theorem 3.2 hold, then there exists* $0 < C_f < 1$ *such*

that w.p.a.1,

$$C_f/2 \leq \inf_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,0}||_\infty \leq \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}_{t,0}||_\infty \leq 2/C_f. \tag{K.10}$$

For any $k = 0, 1, \cdots, K$ *and* $\widehat{\Psi}_t^k$ *defined in Algorithm 3.1, there exists constant* $0 < C_k < 1$ *such that, w.p.a.1,*

$$C_k/2 \leq \inf_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}_t^k||_\infty \leq \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}} ||\widehat{\Psi}_t^k||_\infty \leq 2C_k. \tag{K.11}$$

In addition, for any $k = 0, 1, \cdots, K$ *and* $\widehat{\Psi}_t^k$ *defined in Algorithm 3.1, there exists constant* $l < 1 < L$ *independent of* n, t, *and* k *such that, uniformly in* $t \in \mathcal{T}$ *and w.p.a.1,*

$$l\widehat{\Psi}_{t,0} \leq \widehat{\Psi}_t^k \leq L\widehat{\Psi}_{t,0}. \tag{K.12}$$

Proof. For (K.10), we denote $\mathcal{F} = \{h(\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - f_t(X))^2 f_j^2(X) : t \in \mathcal{T}, j = 1, \cdots, p\}$ with envelope K_n^2/h. By the proof of Lemma K.6, the entropy of $\mathcal{F}$ is bounded by $p(\frac{A}{\varepsilon})^v$. In addition, $\sup_{f\in\mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}f^2 \leq K_n^2/h$. Therefore,

$$||\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P}||_{\mathcal{F}} \lesssim O_p(\log(p)K_n^2/(nh)).$$

In addition,

$$h\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - f_t(X)\right)^2 f_j^2(X) = \mathbb{E}\int\left[K^2(u) - 2hK(u) + h^2 f_t^2(X)\right] f_{t+hu}(X)du f_j^2(X).$$

Note that $f_t(x)$ is bounded and bounded away from zero uniformly over $(t, x) \in \mathcal{T}\mathcal{X}$. Therefore, there exists some positive constant C_f such that,

$$\begin{aligned} C_f \leq & h \inf_{t\in\mathcal{T}, j=1,\cdots,p} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - f_t(X)\right)^2 f_j^2(X) \\ \leq & h \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}, j=1,\cdots,p} \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - f_t(X)\right)^2 f_j^2(X) \leq 1/C_f. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, w.p.a.1,

$$\begin{aligned} C_f/2 \leq & h \inf_{t\in\mathcal{T}, j=1,\cdots,p} \mathcal{P}_n\left(\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - f_t(X)\right)^2 f_j^2(X) \\ \leq & h \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}, j=1,\cdots,p} \mathcal{P}_n\left(\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h}) - f_t(X)\right)^2 f_j^2(X) \leq 2/C_f. \end{aligned}$$

For $k=0$, we let $\mathcal{F}=\{\frac{1}{h}K^2(\frac{T-t}{h})f_j^2(X):t\in\mathcal{T},j=1,\cdots,p\}$ with envelope K_n^2/h. By the same argument as above, we can show that, w.p.a.1,

$$C_0/2\leq\inf_{t\in\mathcal{T},j=1,\cdots,p}\mathcal{P}_n\frac{1}{h}K^2(\frac{T-t}{h})f_j^2(X)\leq\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},j=1,\cdots,p}\mathcal{P}_n\frac{1}{h}K^2(\frac{T-t}{h})f_j^2(X)\leq 2/C_0.$$

For $k\geq 1$, by Theorem 3.2 with $\widehat{\Psi}_t=\widehat{\Psi}_t^{k-1}$, we have, w.p.a.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},j=1,\cdots,p}|\mathcal{P}_nh(\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h})-\hat{f}_t^k(X))^2f_j^2(X)|\\
\leq&\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},j=1,\cdots,p}|\mathcal{P}_nh(\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h})-f_t(X))^2f_j^2(X)|+\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},j=1,\cdots,p}|\mathcal{P}_nh(\hat{f}_t^k(X)-f_t(X))^2f_j^2(X)|\\
\leq&\sup_{t\in\mathcal{T},j=1,\cdots,p}l_{t,0,j}^2+O_p(l_n\log(p)sK_n^2h/n)\\
\leq&2/C_f.
\end{aligned}\tag{K.13}$$

Similarly, we can show that, w.p.a.1,

$$\inf_{t\in\mathcal{T},j=1,\cdots,p}||\mathcal{P}_nh(\frac{1}{h}K(\frac{T-t}{h})-\hat{f}_t^k(X))^2f_j^2(X)||_\infty\geq C_f/2.$$

This concludes (K.11) wit $C_k=C_f$ for $k=1,\cdots,K$. Last, (K.12) holds with

$$l=\min(C_0C_f/4,\cdots,C_kC_f/4,1)\quad\text{and}\quad L=\max(4/(C_0C_f),\cdots,4/(C_kC_f),1).$$

□

Lemma K.8. *Assumptions 9 and 10 hold in the proof of Theorem 3.4.*

Proof. We verify only the case in which $\delta_n=h^{1/2}$. The case in which $\delta_n=1$ can be verified similarly. Note that $Q(t,v)=\alpha(t,\psi^{\leftarrow}(v))$, $\partial_u\alpha(t,u)=f_{Y_t}(u)>0$ uniformly over $(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}$, and $\psi(\cdot)$ can be chosen such that $\partial_v\psi^{\leftarrow}(v)>0$ uniformly over $v\in[0,1]$. This verifies Assumption 9.1.

For Assumption 9.2, notice that

$$h_n(t,v)=(nh)^{1/2}(\hat{\alpha}_{t,\psi^{\leftarrow}(v)}-\alpha(t,\psi^{\leftarrow}(v))).$$

By Theorem 3.3, $\sup_{(t,v)\in\mathcal{T}\times[0,1]}|h_n(t,v)|=O_p(\log^{1/2}(n))$. So we can take $\varepsilon_n=(nh)^{-1/2}\log(n)$. In addition, $\sup_{(t,v)\in\mathcal{T}\times[0,1]}|h_n^2(t,v)|s_n=O_p(\log(n)(nh)^{-1/2})=o_p(h^{1/2})$ because $nh^2\to\infty$.

So we only need to show

$$\sup_{(t,v,v')\in\mathcal{T}\times[0,1]^2,|v-v'|\leq\varepsilon_n} |h_n(t,v) - h_n(t,v')| = o_p(h^{1/2}). \tag{K.14}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} \eta\Pi_{t,u}(W_u, \phi_{t,u}, f_t) - \Pi_{t,u'}(W'_u, \phi_{t,u'}, f_t) : u = \psi^{\leftarrow}(v), u' = \psi^{\leftarrow}(v'), \\ (t,v,v') \in \mathcal{T}\times[0,1]^2, |v-v'| \leq \varepsilon_n \end{array} \right\}$$

with envelope $c\eta h^{-1}$. By Theorem 3.3, we have

$$h_n(t,v) - h_n(t,v') = (\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})g + R_n(t,\psi^{\leftarrow}(v)) - R_n(t,\psi^{\leftarrow}(v')).$$

$\sup_{(t,v)\in\mathcal{T}\times[0,1]} R_n(t,\psi^{\leftarrow}(v)) = o_p(\delta_n)$. So we only have to show that

$$\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}} |(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})g| = o_p(h^{1/2}).$$

We know that $\mathcal{G}$ is VC-type with fixed VC index and that

$$\sup_{g\in\mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}g^2 \leq \varepsilon_n h^{-1}.$$

In addition, as shown in the proof of Theorem 3.4, $||\max_{1\leq i\leq n} |\eta_i h^{-1}|||_{P,2} \leq \log(n)$. Therefore, by Corollary 5.1 of Chernozhukov et al. (2014), we have

$$(nh)^{1/2}||(\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P})g||_{\mathcal{G}} = O_p((\log(n)\varepsilon_n)^{1/2}).$$

Given $\varepsilon_n = (nh)^{-1/2}\log(n)$, $(\log(n)\varepsilon_n)^{1/2} = o(h^{1/2})$ because $h = C_h n^{-H}$ for some $H < 1/3$. This establishes (K.14).

Next, we check Assumption 10. Recall that $F(t,y) = \psi(q_y(t))$, $f(t,y) = \psi'(q_y(t))/f_{Y_t}(q_y(t))$. Because $f_{Y_t}(q_y(t))$ is bounded and bounded away from zero uniformly over $(t,y) \in \mathcal{T}\mathcal{Y}$, so be $f(t,y)$. In addition,

$$f'(t,y) = \psi''(q_y(t))/f^2_{Y_t}(q_y(t)) - \phi'(q_y(t))f'_{Y_t}(q_y(t))/f^3_{Y_t}(q_y(t))$$

which is bounded because $f'_{Y_t}(q_y(t))$ is bounded. This verifies Assumption 10.2.

For Assumption 10.3, we note that

$$J_n(t,y) = \frac{F(t,y|h_n) - F(t,y|h_n)}{s_n} = -\frac{h_n(t,\psi(q_y(t)))\psi'(q_y(t))}{f_{Y_t}(q_y(t))} + o_p(\delta_n)$$

where the $o_p(\delta_n)$ is uniform over $(t,y) \in \mathcal{TY}$. In addition, by definition, $(t, q_y(t)) \in \mathcal{TU}$, $f_{Y_t}(q_y(t))$ is bounded away from zero, and we can choose ψ such that $\psi'(q_y(t))$ is bounded. Therefore, by Theorem 3.3,

$$\sup_{(t,y)\in\mathcal{TY}} |J_n(t,y)| = O_p(\sup_{(t,u)\in\mathcal{TU}} |h_n(t,\psi(u))|) + o_p(\delta_n) = O_p(\log^{1/2}(n)).$$

We can choose $\varepsilon_n = s_n \log(n)$. In addition,

$$\sup_{(t,y)\in\mathcal{TY}} |J_n(t,y)|^2 s_n = o_p(h^{1/2})$$

because $nh^3 \to \infty$. So we only need to show that

$$\sup_{(t,y,y')\in\mathcal{TYY},|y-y'|\le\max(\varepsilon_n,s_n\delta_n)} |J_n(t,y) - J_n(t,y')| = o_p(\delta_n).$$

Note that, for $v = \psi(Q_{Y_t}(y))$ and $v' = \psi(Q_{Y_t}(y'))$

$$|J_n(t,y) - J_n(t,y')| \lesssim |h_n(t,v) - h_n(t,v')| + o_p(\delta_n).$$

In addition, $\phi(Q_{Y_t}(y))$ is Lipschitz uniformly over $(t,y) \in \mathcal{TY}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{(t,y,y')\in\mathcal{TYY},|y-y'|\le\max(\varepsilon_n,s_n\delta_n)} |J_n(t,y) - J_n(t,y')| \\
\le &\sup_{(t,v,v')\in\mathcal{T}\times[0,1]^2,|v-v'|\le C\varepsilon_n} |h_n(t,v) - h_n(t,v')| = o_p(\delta_n),
\end{aligned}$$

given that $h = C_h n^{-H}$ for some $H < 1/3$. This completes the verification of Assumption 10.2.

Last, it is essentially the same as above to verify Assumption 10 for $J_n(t,u) = (nh)^{1/2}(\hat{\alpha}^{*r}(t,u) - \alpha(t,u))$. The proof is omitted. □

Lemma K.9. *If the assumptions in Theorem 3.5 hold, then*

$$\begin{aligned}&e_2'(G\widehat{\Sigma}_2)^{-1}U_n(t,\tau)\\=&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\eta_j(\kappa_2 f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t))f_t(X_j)h^2)^{-1}\left[Y_{q_\tau(t),j}-\phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j)\right]\overline{K}(\frac{T_j-t}{h})+o_p^*((nh^3)^{-1/2}).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Note that

$$U_n(t,\tau)=\frac{2}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\eta_j\mathcal{P}\Gamma^s(\cdot,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)+\mathcal{U}_nH(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau),\tag{K.15}$$

where $\mathcal{U}_n$ assigns probability $\frac{1}{n(n-1)}$ to each pair of observations and

$$H(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)=\eta_i\eta_j\Gamma^s(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)-\eta_i\mathcal{P}\Gamma^s(\cdot,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)-\eta_j\mathcal{P}\Gamma^s(\Upsilon_i,\cdot;t,\tau)+\mathcal{P}\Gamma^s(\cdot,\cdot;t,\tau).$$

Further denote $\tilde{\eta}_i=\eta_i\mathbb{1}\{|\eta_i|\le C'\log(n)\}$, $\mu_n=1-\mathbb{E}\tilde{\eta}_i$, and

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{H}(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)=&\tilde{\eta}_i\tilde{\eta}_j\Gamma^s(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)-(1-\mu_n)\tilde{\eta}_i\mathcal{P}\Gamma^s(\cdot,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)\\&-(1-\mu_n)\tilde{\eta}_j\mathcal{P}\Gamma^s(\Upsilon_i,\cdot;t,\tau)+(1-\mu_n)^2\mathcal{P}\Gamma^s(\cdot,\cdot;t,\tau).\end{aligned}$$

Since η has a sub-exponential tail, we can choose C' large enough such that

$$|\mu_n|\le n^{-2}\quad\text{and}\quad\lim_{n\to\infty}P\left(\max_{1\le i\le n}|\eta_i|>C'\log(n)\right)=0.$$

This means that, w.p.a.1,

$$\max_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}}\left|\mathcal{U}_n\left[H(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)-\tilde{H}(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)\right]\right|\lesssim n^{-1},$$

because

$$|K(\frac{T_i-t}{h})(T_i-t)|\le Ch,\tag{K.16}$$

$\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}}|\Gamma^s(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)|\lesssim h^{-3}$, and $nh^3\to\infty$.

We next bound the U-process $\mathcal{U}_n\tilde{H}(\cdot,\cdot;t,\tau)=(C_n^2)^{-1}\sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\tilde{H}(\Upsilon_i,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)$, Let

$$\mathcal{H}=\{\tilde{H}(\cdot,\cdot;t,\tau),(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}\}.$$

Then $\mathcal{H}$ is Euclidean and has envelop $(C\log^2(n)h^{-2}, C\log^2(n)h^{-3})'$. Denote $g(\Upsilon;t,\tau) = \mathbb{E}H^2(\Upsilon,\cdot;t,\tau)$ with envelope $(C\log^2(n)h^{-3}, C\log^2(n)h^{-5})$. By simply moment calculations, we have

$$\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}} \mathbb{E}g(\Upsilon;t,\tau) \lesssim (Ch^{-2}, Ch^{-4})'$$

and

$$\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}} \mathbb{E}g^2(\Upsilon;t,\tau) \lesssim (Ch^{-5}, Ch^{-9})'.$$

Then, by Lemma J.1, we have

$$\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}} \mathcal{U}_n\tilde{H}(\cdot,\cdot;t,\tau) = (O_p(\log(n)(nh)^{-1}), O_p(\log(n)(nh^2)^{-1}))'$$

and thus

$$\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}} \mathcal{U}_n H(\cdot,\cdot;t,\tau) = (O_p(\log(n)(nh)^{-1}), O_p(\log(n)(nh^2)^{-1}))'. \tag{K.17}$$

We now compute $\mathcal{P}\Gamma^s(\cdot,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{P}\Gamma^s(\cdot,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)\\
&= \begin{Bmatrix} \int \frac{f_T(t+hv)}{f_{Y_{t+hv}}(q_\tau(t+hv))}\left(\frac{Y_{q_\tau(t+hv),j}-\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)}{f_{t+hv}(X_j)h}K(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h}) + \phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j) - \tau\right)K(v)dv \\ \int \frac{vf_T(t+hv)}{hf_{Y_{t+hv}}(q_\tau(t+hv))}\left(\frac{Y_{q_\tau(t+hv),j}-\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)}{f_{t+hv}(X_j)h}K(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h}) + \phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j) - \tau\right)K(v)dv \end{Bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the usual maximal inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}}\Bigg|\frac{2}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j \int \frac{f_T(t+hv)}{f_{Y_{t+hv}}(q_\tau(t+hv))}\Bigg(&\frac{Y_{q_\tau(t+hv),j}-\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)}{f_{t+hv}(X_j)h}K(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h})\\
&+\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)-\tau\Bigg)K(v)dv\Bigg| = O_p(\log^{1/2}(n)(nh)^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

For the second element in $\mathcal{P}\Gamma^s(\cdot,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau)$, we first note that

$$\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}} \left|\int \frac{vf_T(t+hv)}{hf_{Y_{t+hv}}(q_\tau(t+hv))}\left(\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)-\tau\right)K(v)dv\right| = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

So we can focus on

$$\int v\overline{f}(X_j;t+hv)\frac{Y_{q_\tau(t+hv),j}-\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)}{h^2}K(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h})K(v)dv$$

where $\overline{f}(X_j;t) = \frac{f_T(t)}{f_{Y_t}(q_\tau(t))f_t(X_j)}$. Since

$$\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}} \mathbb{E}\int v[\overline{f}(X_j;t+hv)-\overline{f}(X_j;t)]\frac{Y_{q_\tau(t+hv),j}-\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)}{h^2}K(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h})K(v)dv = O(h^2)$$

and

$$\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}} \mathbb{E}\left[\int v[\overline{f}(X_j;t+hv)-\overline{f}(X_j;t)]\frac{Y_{q_\tau(t+hv),j}-\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)}{h^2}K(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h})K(v)dv\right]^2$$
$$\lesssim \sup_{t\in\mathcal{T}}\int h^{-2}v^2\mathbb{E}K^2(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h})K(v)dv \lesssim h^{-1},$$

we have

$$\sup_{(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j \int v[\overline{f}(X_j;t+hv)-\overline{f}(X_j;t)]\frac{Y_{q_\tau(t+hv),j}-\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)}{h^2}K(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h})K(v)dv$$
$$=O_p(\log^{1/2}(n)(nh)^{-1/2}).$$

Furthermore, uniformly over $(t,\tau)\in\mathcal{TI}$,

$$\int \frac{v\overline{f}(X_j;t)}{h^2}\left[Y_{q_\tau(t+hv),j}-\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)-(Y_{q_\tau(t),j}-\phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j))\right]K(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h})K(v)dv$$

has $O(h^2)$ bias and

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\int \frac{v\overline{f}(X_j;t)}{h^2}\left[Y_{q_\tau(t+hv),j}-\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)-(Y_{q_\tau(t),j}-\phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j))\right]K(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h})K(v)dv\right\}^2$$
$$\lesssim \int \mathbb{E}v^2h^{-4}\Big(|\phi_{T_j,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)-\phi_{T_j,q_\tau(t)}(X_j)|+(\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)-\phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j))^2\Big)$$
$$\times K^2(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h})K(v)dv \lesssim h^{-2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \eta_j \int \frac{v\overline{f}(X_j;t)}{h^2}\left[Y_{q_\tau(t+hv),j}-\phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)-(Y_{q_\tau(t),j}-\phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j))\right]K(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h})K(v)dv$$
$$=O_p^*(\log^{1/2}(n)(nh^2)^{-1/2}).$$

Combining the above results and denoting $\overline{K}(u) = \int vK(u-v)K(v)dv$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\eta_j \int v\overline{f}(X_j;t+hv)\frac{Y_{q_\tau(t+hv),j} - \phi_{t+hv,q_\tau(t+hv)}(X_j)}{h^2}K(\frac{T_j-t-hv}{h})K(v)dv \\
=&\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\eta_j \frac{\overline{f}(X_j;t)}{h^2}\left[Y_{q_\tau(t),j} - \phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j)\right]\overline{K}(\frac{T_j-t}{h}) = O_p^*(\log^{1/2}(n)(nh^3)^{-1/2})
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{2}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\eta_j \mathcal{P}\Gamma^s(\cdot,\Upsilon_j;t,\tau) = \left\{\begin{array}{c} O_p^*(\log^{1/2}(n)(nh)^{-1/2}) \\ \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\eta_j \frac{\overline{f}(X_j;t)}{h^2}\left[Y_{q_\tau(t),j} - \phi_{t,q_\tau(t)}(X_j)\right]\overline{K}(\frac{T_j-t}{h}) + O_p^*(\log^{1/2}(n)(nh^2)^{-1/2}) \end{array}\right\}. \tag{K.18}$$

Combining (K.15), (K.17), and (K.18), we have the desired results. □